THE WORKS OF M. DE VOLTAIRE.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH.

WITH

NOTES, HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL.

BY T. SMOLLETT, M. D.

T. FRANCKLIN, M. A. AND OTHERS.

IN TWENTY-FOUR VOLUMES.

VOLUME XVII.

THE FOURTH EDITION.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
AUG 17
1912

DUBLIN:

PRINTED BY D. CHAMBERLAINE,

FOR R. MONCRIEFFE IN CAPEL-STREET.

M,DCC,LXXII.

W O R K S

OF

M. DE VOLTAIRE.

CONTENTS

OF THE

SEVENTEENTH VOLUME.

CHAP. I.

A Brief Account of the Death of John Calas, Page 1

CHAP. II.

Consequences of the Execution of John Calas, 13

CHAP. III.

A Sketch of the Reformation in the Sixteenth Century, 15

CHAP. IV.

Whether Toleration is dangerous; and among what Nations it is practised, 20

CHAP. V.

In what Cases Toleration may be admitted, 28

CHAP. VI.

If Non-Toleration is agreeable to the Law of Nature and of Society, page 32

CHAP. VII.

If Non-Toleration was known among the Greeks, 33

CHAP. VIII.

Whether the Romans encouraged Toleration, 36

CHAP. IX.

Of Martyrs, 43

CHAP. X.

Of the Danger of False Legends and Persecution, 55

CHAP. XI.

The ill Consequences of Non-Toleration, 61

CHAP. XII.

If Non-Toleration was Part of the Divine Law among the Jews, and whether it was always put in Practice, 67

CHAP. XIII.

The great Toleration exercised among the Jews, 84

CHAP.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. XIV.

If Non-Toleration was taught by Chriſt, page 93

CHAP. XV.

Teſtimonies againſt Perſecution, 100

CHAP. XVI.

A Converſation between a Dying Man, and one in good Health, 102

CHAP XVII.

A Letter from a Beneficed Prieſt to Father Le Tellier, the Jeſuit, dated the 6th of May, 1714, 105

CHAP. XVIII.

The only Caſes in which Non-Toleration makes Part of the Human Law, 109

CHAP. XIX.

Account of a Controverſial Diſpute, which happened in China, 111

CHAP. XX.

Whether it is of Service to indulge the People in Superſtition, 114

CHAP.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. XXI.

Virtue is better than Learning, page 117

CHAP. XXII.

Of Universal Toleration, 119

CHAP. XXIII.

An Address to the Deity, 123

CHAP. XXIV.

Postscript, 124

CHAP. XXV.

Sequel and Conclusion, 130

MISCELLANIES.

Of Ceremonies, 139

Folly on both Sides, 142

Memnon; or Human Wisdom, 150

A Letter from a Turk, concerning the Faquirs and his Friend Bababec, 157

Of Vain Glory: Being the Substance of a Conversation with a Chinese, 161

Of

CONTENTS.

Of Suicide; or, Self-murder, page 165

Of the Religion of the Quakers, 171

Of the Religion of the Quakers, continued, 176

The History of the Quakers, 179

Conclusion of the History of the Quakers, 183

Of the Church of England. 188

Of the Presbyterians, 192

Of the Socinians, or Arians, or Antitrinitarians, 195

Of the Parliament, 198

Of the English Constitution, 202

Of their Commerce, 208

On Inoculation of the Small Pox, 211

On Chancellor Bacon, 218

On Locke, 224

On the Soul, 229

On Toleration; and on the Maxim, that it is impossible Philosophers should be of prejudice to Human Society, 235

On Descartes and Newton, 239

On Newton, 245

On

On Chronology, as reformed by Newton, who makes the World younger than the common Æra by five hundred years, page 249

On the Engliſh Tragedy, 254

On the Engliſh Comedy, 262

On Courtiers who have cultivated Learning, 268

On the Earl of Rocheſter and Mr. Waller, 271

On Prior; that ſingular Poem called Hudibras, and Dean Swift, 277

On Pope, 286

A Brief

A

TREATISE

UPON

TOLERATION, &c.

CHAP. I.

A brief Account of the Death of John Calas.

THE murder of John Calas, committed at Toulouſe with the ſword of juſtice, the 9th of March, 1762, is an event, which, on account of its ſingularity, calls for the attention of the preſent age, and that of poſterity. We ſoon forget the croud of victims who have fallen in the courſe of innumerable battles, not only becauſe this is a deſtiny inevitably connected with a life of warfare, but becauſe thoſe who thus fall might alſo have given death to their enemies, and did not loſe their lives till after having firſt ſtood in their own defence. Where the danger and the advantage are equal, our wonder ceaſes, and even pity itſelf is, in ſome meaſure, leſſened; but where the father of an innocent family is delivered up to the ſword of error, prejudice, or enthuſiaſm, where the

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY C AU 17 1912 CAMBRIDGE

accuſed perſon has no other defence but his conſcious virtue; where the arbiters of his deſtiny have nothing to hazard in putting him to death, but the having been miſtaken, and where they may murder with impunity under the ſanction of a judicial proceſs; then every one is ready to cry out, every one brings the caſe home to himſelf, and ſees with fear and trembling, that no perſon's life is in ſafety in a court erected to watch over the lives of the ſubject; the public unite in demanding vengeance.

In this ſtrange affair, we find religion, ſelf-murder and parricide blended. The object of inquiry was, whether a father and a mother had murdered their own ſon with a view to pleaſe God, and whether a brother had murdered his brother, or a friend his friend; or whether the judges had to reproach themſelves with having publicly executed an innocent father, or with having acquitted a guilty mother, brother, and friend.

John Calas, a perſon of ſixty-eight years of age, had followed the profeſſion of a merchant at Toulouſe for upwards of forty years, and had always borne the character of a tender parent in his family and neighbourhood; he was himſelf by religion a proteſtant, as was alſo his wife, and all his children, one ſon only excepted, who had abjured hereſy, and to whom the father allowed a ſmall annuity; indeed, the good man appeared ſo far from being infected with that abſurd zeal, which deſtroys the bands of ſociety, that he even approved of the converſion of his ſon Lewis Calas: he had for above thirty years kept in his houſe a maid ſervant, who was a zealous catholic, and who had brought up all his children.

Another of his ſons, whoſe name was Mark Anthony, was a man of letters, but, at the ſame time, of a reſtleſs, gloomy, and impetuous diſpoſition. This young man finding, that he had no proſpect of getting into buſineſs as a merchant, for which indeed he was very unfit, nor of being admitted to the bar as a lawyer, as not being able to obtain the requiſite certificates of his being a catholic, reſolved to lay violent hands upon himſelf, and gave ſome intimation of his deſign to one of his

his friends: in order to confirm himſelf in the reſolution he had formed, he carefully collected every thing that had been written upon the ſubject of ſuicide all which he read with great attention; at length, one day having loſt all his money at play, he choſe that as a moſt proper opportunity for putting his deſign in execution. One Lavaiſſe, a young man of nineteen years of age, the ſon of a lawyer in great repute at Toulouſe, and who was eſteemed by every one who knew him, happened to come from Bourdeaux the evening before *; when he went by chance to ſup with the Calas family at their houſe, being an acquaintance of that family, and of Mark Anthony Calas in particular. Old Calas, his wife, Mark Anthony their eldeſt ſon, and Peter their ſecond ſon, ſupped all together that evening; after ſupper was over, they retired into another room, when Mark Anthony ſuddenly diſappeared. After ſome time, young Lavaiſſe took his leave, and Peter Calas accompanied him down ſtairs: when they came to the warehouſe they ſaw Mark Anthony hanging in his ſhirt behind the door, and his coat and waiſtcoat folded up and laid upon the counter; his ſhirt was not in the leaſt rumpled, nor his hair, which he had dreſſed that day, in any wiſe diſordered; there was no wound upon his body, nor any other mark of violence †.

We ſhall not here enter into all the minute circumſtances with which the lawyers have filled their briefs; nor ſhall we attempt to deſcribe the grief and diſtraction of the unhappy parents; their cries were heard by the whole neighbourhood. Lavaiſſe and Peter Calas, almoſt beſide themſelves, ran, the one to fetch a ſurgeon, and the other an officer of juſtice. While they were thus employed, and old Calas and his wife in all the agonies of grief, the people of the town gathered in crouds about the houſe: The Touloufians are a ſuperſtitious and head-ſtrong people, and look upon every

* 12 October, 1761.

† After the body was carried to the town-houſe indeed, there was found a little ſcratch upon the end of the noſe, and a ſmall black and blue ſpot upon the breaſt; but theſe were probably occaſioned by ſome careleſſneſs in removing the corpſe.

one, even their own relations, who are not of the ſame religion of themſelves, as monſters and objects of deteſtation. It was at Toulouſe that a ſolemn thankſgiving was ordered for the death of Henry III. and that the inhabitants took an oath to murder the firſt perſon who ſhould propoſe to acknowledge that great and good prince Henry IV. for their ſovereign; and this ſame city ſtill continues to ſolemnize, by an annual proceſſion, illuminations, and bonfires, the day in which about two hundred years ago, it ordered the maſſacre of four thouſand of its citizens for being heretics. In vain has the council iſſued ſix arrets, prohibiting the keeping this deteſtable anniverſary, the Toulouſians ſtill continuing to celebrate it as a high feſtival.

Some one among the mob, a greater enthuſiaſt than the reſt, cried out, that John Calas himſelf had hanged his ſon; this cry became in an inſtant unanimous: ſome perſons taking occaſion to obſerve, that the deceaſed was to have made his abjuration as the next day, and that his own family and young Lavaiſſe had murdered him, out of the hatred they bore to the catholic religion, no ſooner was this opinion broached, than it was fully believed by every one; and the whole town was perſuaded, that it is one of the articles of the proteſtant religion, for a father or mother to murder their own ſon, if he attempts to ſhew any inclination to change his faith.

When the minds of the populace are once put into a ferment, they are not eaſily appeaſed; it was now imagined, that all the proteſtants of Languedoc had aſſembled together the preceding night, and had choſen, by a plurality of voices, one of their ſect for an executioner; that the choice had fallen upon Lavaiſſe; that this young man had, in leſs than four and twenty hours, received the news of his election, and had come from Bourdeaux to aſſiſt John Calas, his wife, and their ſon Peter, to murder a ſon, a brother, and a friend.

The ſieur David, capitoul of Toulouſe, inſtigated by thoſe rumours, and being deſirous to make himſelf be taken notice of, by the ready execution of his office, took a ſtep contrary to all the eſtabliſhed rules and ordinances, by ordering the Calas family, together with the

their catholic maid ſervant and Lavaiſſe, to be put in irons.

After this a monitary was publiſhed, which was as erroneous as the former ſtep. Nay, matters were carried ſtill farther; Mark Anthony Calas had certainly died a Calviniſt, and as ſuch, if he had laid violent hands upon himſelf, his body ought to have been dragged upon a hurdle; whereas it was interred with the greateſt funeral pomp in the church of St. Stephen, notwithſtanding the curate entered his proteſt againſt this profanation of holy ground.

There are in Languedoc four orders of penitentiaries, the white, the blue, the grey, and the black, who wear a long capuchin or hood, having a maſk of cloth falling down over the face, in which are two holes for the ſight. Theſe orders wanted the duke of Fitz-James to become one of their body, but he refuſed them. On the preſent occaſion the white penitentiaries performed a ſolemn ſervice for Mark Anthony Calas as for a martyr; nor was the feſtival of a real martyr ever celebrated with greater pomp by any church: but then this pomp was truly terrible. Beneath a magnificent canopy was placed a ſkeleton, which was made to move by ſprings; this ſkeleton was to repreſent Mark Anthony Calas, holding in one hand a branch of palm, and in the other the pen with which he was to ſign his abjuration of hereſy; or rather, as the ſequel proved, the death-warrant of his father.

And now nothing more remained to be done for this wretch who had been his own murderer but the office of canonization; the people, already to a man, looked upon him as a ſaint, ſome invoked him, ſome went to pray at his tomb, ſome beſought him to work miracles, while others gravely recounted thoſe he had already performed; a monk pulled out one or two of his teeth, in order to have ſome laſting relics; an old woman, more pious than the reſt, but unhappily troubled with a deafneſs, declared, that ſhe had heard the ſound of bells very plain at his interment; and a prieſt was cured of an apoplectic fit, after taking a ſtout emetic: verbal proceſſes were drawn up of theſe ſtupendous

miracles; and the author of this account has in his poſſeſſion an affidavit, to prove, that a young man of Toulouſe, had his brain turned, on having prayed ſeveral nights ſucceſſively at the tomb of the new ſaint, without having been able to obtain the miracle he requeſted of him.

Among the order of the white penitentiaries there were ſome magiſtrates of juſtice; the death of John Calas ſeemed then inevitable.

But what more particularly haſtened his fate, was the approach of that ſingular feſtival, which, as I have already obſerved, the Touloufians celebrate every year, in commemoration of the maſſacre of four thouſand Hugonots; the year 1762, happened to be the *annum ſeculare* of this execrable deed. The inhabitants were buſied in making preparations for the ſolemnity; this circumſtance added freſh fuel to the heated imagination of the populace: every one cryed out, that a ſcaffold, for executing the Calas family upon, would be one of the greateſt ornaments of the ceremony; and that heaven itſelf ſeemed to have brought them thither as victims, to be ſacrificed to our holy religion. Twenty perſons were ear witneſſes to theſe ſpeeches, and to others ſtill more outrageous. And this, in the preſent age! this at a time when philoſophy has made ſo great a progreſs! and while the pens of an hundred academies are employed in inculcating humanity and gentleneſs of manners; it ſhould ſeem, that enthuſiaſm, enraged at the late ſucceſs of reaſon, fought under her ſtandard with redoubled fury.

Thirteen judges met every day, to try this cauſe: they had not, they could not, have any proofs againſt this unhappy family; but miſtaken zeal held the place of proofs. Six of the judges continued a long time obſtinate, being reſolved to ſentence John Calas, his ſon, and Lavaiſſe, to be broke upon the wheel, and his wife to be burnt at the ſtake; the other ſeven judges, rather more moderate, were at leaſt for having the accuſed examined; the debates were frequent and long. One of the judges, convinced in his mind of the innocence of the parties, and of the impoſſibility of the crime laid

to

to their charge, ſpoke warmly in their favour; he oppoſed the zeal of humanity to that of cruelty, and openly pleaded the cauſe of the Calas family in all the houſes of Toulouſe where miſguided religion demanded with inceſſant cries the blood of theſe unfortunate wretches. Another judge, well known for his violence and ſeverity, went about the town, raving with as much fury againſt the accuſed, as his brother had been earneſt in defending them. In ſhort, the conteſt became ſo warm, that both were obliged to enter proteſts againſt each other's proceedings, and retire into the country.

But by a ſtrange fatality, the judge who had been on the favourable ſide, had the delicacy to perſiſt in his exceptions, and the other returned back to give his vote againſt thoſe on whom he could no longer ſit as judge; and it was his ſingle vote which carried the ſentence of being broke upon the wheel againſt them, there being eight voices againſt five, one of the ſix merciful judges being at laſt, after much conteſtation, brought over to the rigorous ſide.

In my opinion, in caſes of parricide, and where the maſter of a family is to be devoted to the moſt dreadful puniſhment, the ſentence ought to be unanimous; inaſmuch, as the proofs of ſo unparallel'd * a crime, ought to be proved in ſuch a manner, as to ſatisfy all the

* I know of but two inſtances in hiſtory of fathers having murdered their children on the ſcore of religion; the firſt is the father of St. Barbara, as ſhe is called; it ſeems he had ordered two windows to be made in his bathing-room. St. Barbara, in his abſence, took it into her head to make a third in honour of the holy trinity: ſhe alſo with the end of her finger made the ſign of the croſs upon the marble pillars; which remained deeply impreſſed thereon: her father, in a violent fury to have his room thus marked, runs after her with his ſword in his hand with an intention to kill her; ſhe flies towards a mountain, which very complaiſantly opens upon her approach to give her a paſſage. Her father finds himſelf obliged to go round about, and at length gets hold of his fugitive daughter, whom he ſtrips and prepares to ſcourge; but God envelopes her with a white cloud; however, after all, her father cauſed her head to be ſtruck off. This is the ſtory, as we find it related in the book called, *The Flower of Saints.*

world; and the leaſt ſhadow of a doubt in a caſe of this nature, ſhould be ſufficient to make a judge tremble, who is about to paſs ſentence of death. The weakneſs of our reaſon, and the inſufficiency of our laws, become every day more obvious; but ſurely, there cannot be a greater example of this deficiency, than that one ſingle caſting vote ſhould be ſufficient to condemn a fellow citizen to be broke alive upon the wheel: the Athenians required at leaſt fifty voices, over and above the one half of the judges, before they would dare to pronounce ſentence of death; but to what does all this tend? Why to what we know, but make very little uſe of, that the Greeks were wiſer and more humane than ourſelves.

It appeared altogether impoſſible that John Calas, who was an old man of ſixty-eight, and had a long while been troubled with a ſwelling and weakneſs in his legs, ſhould have been able by himſelf to have maſtered his ſon and hanged him, who was a ſtout young fellow of eight and twenty, and more than commonly robuſt; therefore he muſt abſolutely have been aſſiſted in this act by his wife, his other ſon Peter Calas, Lavaiſſe, and by the ſervant maid, and they had been together the whole night of this fatal adventure. But this ſuppoſition is altogether as abſurd as the other; for can any one believe that a ſervant, who was a zealous catholic, would have permitted thoſe whom ſhe looked upon as heretics, to murder a young man whom ſhe herſelf had brought up, for his attachment to a religion that ſhe herſelf was devoted to? That Lavaiſſe would have come purpoſely from Bourdeaux to aſſiſt in hanging his friend, whoſe pretended converſion he knew nothing of; or, that an affectionate mother would have joined in laying violent hands upon her own ſon? And laſtly, how could they all together have been able to ſtrangle a young man ſtronger than them all,

The ſecond inſtance is of prince Hermenegildus, who raiſed a rebellion againſt the king his father, and gave him battle in the year 584, but was himſelf defeated and ſlain by one of his father's generals; however, he has been placed among the martyrs, becauſe his father was an Arian.

all, without a long and violent ſtruggle, or without his making ſuch a noiſe as muſt have been heard by the whole neighbourhood, without repeated blows paſſing between them, without any marks of violence, or without any of their cloaths being in the leaſt diſordered!

It was evident, that if this murder could in the nature of things have been committed, the accuſed perſons were all of them equally guilty, becauſe they did not quit each other's company an inſtant the whole night; but then it was equally evident that they were not guilty, and that the father alone could not be ſo, and yet, by the ſentence of the judges, the father alone was condemned to ſuffer.

The motive upon which this ſentence was paſſed, was as unaccountable as all the reſt of the proceeding, Thoſe judges who, had given their opinion for the execution of John Calas, perſuaded the others, that this poor old man, unable to ſupport the torments, would, when upon the wheel, make a full confeſſion of his own guilt, and that of his accomplices: but how wretchedly were they confounded, when yielding up his breath upon that inſtrument of execution, he called God as a witneſs of his innocence, and beſought him to forgive his judges!

They were afterwards obliged to paſs a ſecond decree, which contradicted the firſt, namely, to ſet at liberty the mother, her ſon Peter, young Lavaiſſe, and the maid-ſervant; but one of the counſellors having made them ſenſible that this latter decree contradicted the other, and that they condemned themſelves, inaſmuch, as it having been proved that all the accuſed parties had been conſtantly together during the whole time the murder was ſuppoſed to be committed, the ſetting at liberty the ſurvivors was an inconteſtible proof of the innocence of the maſter of the family whom they had ordered to be executed; upon this, it was determined to baniſh Peter Calas the ſon, which was an act as ill-grounded and abſurd as any of the reſt; for Peter Calas was either guilty or not guilty of the murder: if he was

guilty, he ought to have ſuffered in the ſame manner as his father; if he was innocent there was no reaſon for baniſhing him. But the judges, frightened with the ſufferings of the father, and with that affecting piety with which he had reſigned his life, thought to preſerve their characters by making people believe, that they ſhewed mercy to the ſon; as if this was not a new degree of prevarication, and that, thinking no bad conſequences could ariſe from baniſhing this young man, who was poor and deſtitute of friends, was not a very great additional act of injuſtice, after that which they had been already ſo unfortunate to commit.

They now began to go to work with Peter Calas in in his confinement, threatening to treat him as they had done his father, if he would not abjure his religion. This the young man has declared upon oath, as follows:

"A Dominican friar came to me to my cell, and "threatened me with the ſame kind of death if I did "not abjure; this I atteſt before God this 23d day of "July, 1762."

PETER CALAS.

As Peter was going out of the town, he was met by one of the abbes with a converting ſpirit, who made him return back to Toulouſe, where he was ſhut up in a convent of Dominicans, aud there compelled to perform all the functions of a convert to the catholic religion; this was in part what his perſecutors aimed at, it was the price of his father's blood, and due atonement now ſeemed to be made to the religion, of which they looked upon themſelves as the avengers.

The daughters were next taken from their mother, and ſhut up in a convent. This unhappy woman, who had been, as it were, ſprinkled with the blood of her huſband, who had held her eldeſt ſon lifeleſs within her arms, had ſeen the other baniſhed, her daughters taken from her, herſelf ſtript of her effects, and left alone in the wide world deſtitute of bread, and bereft of hopes, was almoſt weighed down to the grave with the exceſs of her misfortunes. Some certain perſons, who had maturely

maturely weighed all the circumſtances of this horrible adventure, were ſo ſtruck with them, that they preſſed Mrs. Calas, who now led a life of retirement and ſolitude, to exert herſelf, and go and demand juſtice at the foot of the throne. At this time ſhe was ſcarcely able to drag about the remains of a miſerable life; beſides, having been born in England, and brought over to a diſtant province in France when very young, the very name of the city of Paris frightened her. She imagined, that in the capital of the kingdom, they muſt be ſtill more cruel than at Toulouſe: at length, however, the duty of revenging the death of her huſband got the better of her weakneſs. She ſet out for Paris, arrived there half dead; and was ſurpriſed to find herſelf received with tenderneſs, ſympathy, and offers of aſſiſtance.

At Paris reaſon always triumphs over enthuſiaſm, however great; whereas in the more diſtant provinces of the kingdom, enthuſiaſm almoſt always triumphs over reaſon.

Mr. De Beaumont, a famous lawyer of the parliament of Paris, immediately took her cauſe in hand, and drew up an opinion, which was ſigned by fifteen other lawyers. Mr. Loiſſeau, equally famous for his eloquence, likewiſe drew up a memorial in favour of this unhappy family; and Mr. Mariette, ſolicitor to the council, drew up a formal ſtate of the caſe, which ſtruck every one who read it with conviction.

Theſe three noble defenders of the laws and of innocence made the widow a preſent of all the profits ariſing from the publication of theſe pieces *; which filled not only Paris but all Europe with pity for this unfortunate woman, and every one cried aloud for juſtice to be done her. In a word, the public paſſed ſentence on

* It is neceſſary for the Engliſh reader to underſtand, that in Paris it is cuſtomary for the great lawyers or counſellors employed in any remarkable caſe, to publiſh their pleadings on each ſide. On this occaſion however, our author obſerves, "That "theſe publications were pirated in ſeveral towns, by which "Mrs. Calas loſt the advantage that was intended her by this "act of generoſity."

on this affair, long before it was determined by the council.

The ſoft infection made its way even to the cabinet, notwithſtanding the continual round of buſineſs, which often excludes pity, and the conſtant habitude of beholding miſerable objects, which too frequently ſteels the heart of the ſtateſman againſt the cries of diſtreſs. The daughters were reſtored to their diſconſolate mother, and all three in deep mourning, and bathed in tears, drew a ſympathetic flood from the eyes of their judges before whom they proſtrated themſelves in thankful acknowledgements.

Nevertheleſs, this family had ſtill ſome enemies to encounter; for it is to be conſidered that this was an affair of religion. Several perſons, whom in France we call *devots* *, declared publicly, that it was much better to ſuffer an old Calviniſt, though innocent, to be broken alive upon the wheel, than to expoſe eight counſellors of Languedoc to the mortification of being obliged to own, that they had been miſtaken: nay, theſe people made uſe of this very expreſſion; "That "there were more magiſtates than Calas's:" by which it ſhould ſeem they inferred, that the Calas family ought to be ſacrificed to the honour of the magiſtracy. Alas! they never reflected, that the honour of a judge, like that of another man, conſiſts in making reparation for the faults he may have committed.

In France no one believes that the pope, even when aſſiſted by his cardinals, is infallible: ought they then to have believed that eight judges of Toulouſe were ſo? Every ſenſible and diſintereſted perſon did without ſcruple declare, that the decree of the court of juſtice of Toulouſe, would be looked upon as void by all Europe, even though particular conſiderations might prevent it from being declared ſo by the council.

Such was the ſtate of this ſurpriſing affair, when it occaſioned certain impartial, but ſenſible perſons, to form

* *Dévot*, or as we call it in Engliſh *devotee*, comes from the Latin word *devotus*. The *devoti* of ancient Rome were ſuch perſons who devoted themſelves to death for the ſafety or good of the republic; as the Curtii and Decii.

form the deſign of laying before the public a few reflections upon toleration, indulgence, and commiſeration, which the abbe Houteville in his bombaſtic and declamatory work, which is falſe in all the facts, calls a *monſtrous doctrine*, but which reaſon calls the portion of human nature.

Either the judges of Toulouſe, carried away by popular enthuſiaſm, cauſed the innocent maſter of a family to be put to a painful and ignominious death, a thing which is without example; or this maſter of a family and his wife murdered their eldeſt ſon, with the aſſiſtance of another ſon and a friend, which is altogether out of nature. In either caſe, the moſt holy of all religions has been perverted to the production of an enormous crime. It is therefore the intereſt of mankind to examine how far charity or cruelty is conſiſtent with true religion.

CHAP. II.

Conſequences of the Execution of JOHN CALAS.

IF the order of White Penitentiaries had been the the cauſe of the puniſhment of an innocent perſon, and of the utter ruin and diſperſion of a whole family, and of branding them with that ignominy which is annexed to thoſe who ſuffer, when it ought properly to fall only upon thoſe who paſs an unjuſt ſentence; if the frantic hurry of theſe penitentiaries in celebrating as a ſaint one, whom they ought to have treated as a ſelf-murderer, brought a virtuous, an innocent fellow citizen to the ſcaffold; ſurely, this fatal miſtake ought to make them true penitents for the reſt of their lives; and both them and the judges ought to have their eyes continually filled with tears, without wearing a white cloak, or a maſk on their face to hide thoſe tears. We have a proper reſpect for all religious orders; they are edifying; but will all the good they have ever been able to do the ſtate, compenſate for the ſhocking diſaſter of which they had been the cauſe? Their inſtitution

ſeems

ſeems to have been the work of that zeal which animates the catholics of Languedoc againſt thoſe we call Hugonots. One would be tempted to imagine, that they had made a vow to hate their brethren; and that, tho' men have religion enough to hate and perſecute, they have not to love and cheriſh each other. But what would be the caſe, if theſe orders were governed by enthuſiaſtic ſuperiors, as were certain congregations, among whom, to uſe the words of one of our moſt eloquent and learned magiſtrates, the cuſtom of ſeeing viſions was reduced into an art and ſyſtem? Or, that their convents had in them thoſe dark rooms, called meditation rooms, which were filled with pictures of frightful devils, armed with long horns and talons, flaming gulphs, croſſes, and daggers, with the holy name of Jeſus in a ſcroll over them? Edifying ſpectacles, doubtleſs, for eyes already blinded with fanaticiſm, and for imaginations no leſs filled with miſtaken zeal, than with abject ſubmiſſion to the will of their directors!

There have been times, and we know it but too well, in which religious orders have been dangerous to the ſtate. The Frérots and the Flagellants have excited troubles in the kingdom. The league owed its origin to ſuch aſſociations. But wherefore ſhould any ſet of men thus diſtinguiſh themſelves from the reſt of their fellow-citizens? Is it that they think themſelves more perfect? If ſo, it is offering an inſult to the reſt of the community. or are they deſirous that every chriſtian ſhould become a member of their ſociety? Truly, it would be a curious ſight to ſee all the inhabitants of Europe in long hoods and maſks, with two little round holes to peep through! Or, laſtly, do they ſeriouſly think, that this dreſs is more acceptable to God than the coats and waiſtcoats we uſually wear? No, no, there is ſomething more at the bottom; this habit is a kind of controverſial uniform, a ſignal for thoſe of a contrary opinion to ſtand upon their guard: and might in time kindle a kind of civil war in our minds, that would terminate in the moſt terrible conſequences,

ſequences, was not the wiſdom of the king and of his miniſters as great as the folly of theſe fanatics.

Every one is ſufficiently ſenſible what fatal effects have ariſen, ſince chriſtians have begun to diſpute among themſelves concerning modes of belief; the blood of the ſubject has flown in torrents either on the ſcaffold or in the field, from the fourth century to the preſent time. But let us confine ourſelves only to the wars and diſaſters which the diſputes concerning reformation have excited in France, and examine into their ſource. Perhaps a ſhort and faithful portrait of theſe numberleſs calamities, may open the eyes of ſome who have not had the advantage of education, and touch thoſe hearts which are not by nature callous.

CHAP. III.

A SKETCH of the REFORMATION in the Sixteenth Century.

WHEN learning began to revive, and the underſtandings of mankind became more enlightened, there was a general complaint of errors and abuſes; and every one acknowledged the complaint to be juſt.

Pope Alexander VI. made a public purchaſe of the pontifical crown, and his five baſtards ſhared with him the profits. His ſon, the cardinal duke of Borgia, in concert with the pope his father, cauſed the noble families of Vitelli, Urbino, Gravina, and Olivaretto, together with an hundred other lords, to be made away with, in order to ſeize upon their eſtates. Julius II. full of the ſame ſpirit, excommunicated Lewis the Twelfth of France, while he himſelf, armed cap-a-pee, ravaged a part of Italy with fire and ſword. Leo X. in order to raiſe money to pay the expences of his pleaſures, made a ſale of indulgences, like goods in a common market. Thoſe who oppoſed ſuch ſhameful impoſitions, were certainly right in a moral view; let us

ſee

ſee how far they were ſo with regard to us, in a political one.

They aſſerted, that as Jeſus Chriſt had never exacted annates nor reverſions, nor ſold diſpenſations for this world, nor indulgences for the next, they ſaw no reaſon why they ſhould pay a foreign prince his price for theſe things. Suppoſing that the annates, the law proceedings in the pope's court, and the diſpenſations which ſtill ſubſiſt, were to coſt us no more than five hundred thouſand crowns a year; it is clear, that ſince the time of Francis I. that is, in two hundred and fifty years, we have paid a hundred and twenty millions; and if we calculate the different value of the mark of ſilver, we ſhall find this ſum to amount to about two hundred and fifty millions of the preſent money. It may therefore, I think, without any blaſphemy be allowed, that the heretics in propoſing the abolition of theſe very extraordinary taxes, which will be the admiration of poſterity, did, in that reſpect, no great injury to the kingdom, and ſhewed themſelves rather good calculators than bad ſubjects. Add to this, that they were the only perſons who underſtood the Greek language, or had any knowledge of antiquity; let us own likewiſe, without diſſimulation, that, with all their errors, we are indebted to them for the opening of our underſtandings, which had been long buried beneath the moſt barbarous obſcurity.

But as they denied the doctrine of purgatory, concerning which no one ought to have the leaſt doubt, and which, moreover, brought in a comfortable revenue to the monks; as they paid no reverence to relics which every one ought to reverence, and which brought in ſtill greater profits; and laſtly, as they attacked the moſt reſpectable tenets*, their adverſaries made

* They revived the opinion of Berengarius concerning the Euchariſt; they denied that a body can exiſt in a thouſand different places at one time, even by all the exertion of divine omnipotence; they alſo denied, that attributes can ſubſiſt without a ſubject; they held, that it was abſolutely impoſſible that what appears to be ſimple bread and wine to the ſight, the taſte, and

made them no other reply, than by committing them to the ſtake. The king, who ſtiled himſelf their protector, and who kept a body of them in pay in Germany, marched at the head of a proceſſion through Paris, which was concluded by the execution of a number of theſe unhappy wretches; which was as follows:

They were ſuſpended at the end of a long beam, which played upon a pole erected for that purpoſe; and underneath them was kindled a large fire, into which they were alternately lowered, and then raiſed up again, by which they experienced the moſt excruciating torments; till a lingering death at laſt put a period to the longeſt and moſt dreadful puniſhment that cruelty ever invented.

A ſhort

and the ſtomach, can, in the very inſtant of its exiſtence, be annihilated or changed into another ſubſtance: in a word, they maintained all thoſe errors for which Berengarius was formerly condemned. They founded their belief on ſeveral paſſages of the ancient fathers of the church, and particularly of St. Juſtin, who ſays expreſsly in his dialogue againſt Typhonius, "That the offering of fine flour is the figure of the Euchariſt, "which Chriſt has ordered us to make in commemoration of "his paſſion;" καὶ ἡ τῆς σεμιδαλεως, &c. τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, ὃν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ παθους, &c. Ιησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν παρέδωκε ποιεῖν."

They revived all that had been advanced in the firſt ages againſt the worſhip of relics, and brought theſe words of Vigilantius for their authority: "What neceſſity is there for your "paying adoration or even reſpect to a maſs of vile duſt? Can "it be ſuppoſed that the ſouls of deceaſed martyrs retain after "their death an affection for their aſhes? The cuſtoms of the "ancient idolaters are now introduced into the church; we be"gin to light tapers at noon-day; we may, indeed, during our "life-time, mutually pray for each other; but of what ſer"vice can ſuch prayers be after death?"

But they did not take notice how warmly St. Jerom has oppoſed this paſſage in Vigilantius. In ſhort, they referred wholly to the primitive times of the apoſtles, nor could they be brought to acknowledge, that, as the church became more extended and ſtrengthened, there was a neceſſity for extending and ſtrengthening its diſcipline likewiſe; they condemned every thing that had the appearance of riches or grandeur in religion, which, however, ſeem abſolutely neceſſary towards ſupporting the dignity of that worſhip we pay the Deity.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY JUL 17 1912 CAMBRIDGE

A ſhort time before the death of Francis I. the members of the parliament of Provence, whom the clergy had incenſed againſt the inhabitants of Mirandol and Cabriére, applied to the king for a body of troops to attend the execution of nineteen perſons of that country, who had been condemned by them; with the aſſiſtance of this armed force, they maſſacred about ſix thouſand ſouls, without ſparing ſex or age, and reduced thirty villages to aſhes. The people who were the objects of theſe executions, and who had, till then, been in a manner unknown, were doubtleſs to blame for having been born Vaudois; but this was their only crime. They had been ſettled for upwards of three hundred years in deſerts and on mountains, which they had rendered fertile by incredible labour, and led a paſtoral and quiet life, the perfect image of the innocence which we find attributed to the firſt ages of the world. They had no other acquaintance with the towns or villages round about them, but from carrying the produce of their grounds thither to ſell. Totally ignorant of all military operations, they made no defence; but were ſlaughtered like timorous animals, whom we drive into a net, and then knock them on the head *.

After

* The candid and venerable De Thou expreſſes himſelf thus concerning the innocent and unfortunate perſons: "Homines "eſſe qui trecentis circiter abhinc annis aſperum & incultum "ſolum vectigale à dominis acceperint, quod improbo labore "& aſſiduo cultu frugum ferax & aptum pecori reddiderint; "patientiſſimos eos laboris & inediæ, à litibus abhorrentes, erga egenos munificos, tributa principi & ſua jura dominis ſedulò & ſumma fide pendere; Dei cultum aſſiduis precibus "& morum innocentiam præ ſe ferre, cæterum rarò divorum "templa adire, niſi ſi quando ad vicina ſuis finibus oppida mercandi aut negotiorum cauſa divertant; quò ſi quandoque pedem inferant, non dei, divorumque ſtatuis advolvi, nec cereos "eis aut donaria ulla ponere; non ſacerdotes ab eis rogari, ut "pro ſe, aut propinquorum manibus rem divinam faciant, non "cruce frontem inſigniri, uti aliorum moris eſt: cùm cælum "intonant non ſe luſtrali aqua aſpergere, ſed ſublatis in cœlum "oculis dei opem implorare; non religionis ergo peregrè proficiſci, non per vias anté crucium ſimulacra caput aperire; "ſacra

After the death of Francis I. a prince, whom it muſt be confeſſed, was more remarkable for his gallantries and his misfortunes than for his cruelty, the execution of a thouſand heretics, and in particular that of Dubourg, a counſellor of the parliament, together with the maſſacre of Vaſſy, made the perſecuted fly to arms. Their ſect multiplied in proportion with the fires lighted for them, and the ſwords of executioners drawn againſt them, patience gave way to rage, and they followed the example of their enemies in cruelty. Nine civil wars filled France with carnage; and a peace, more fatal than war itſelf, produced the day of St. Bartholomew, which ſtands without example in the annals of crimes.

Henry III. and Henry IV. fell victims to the league; the one by the hand of a Dominican friar, and the other by that of a monſter who had been a brother of the Mendicant order. There are who pretend, that humanity, indulgence, and liberty of conſcience, are horrible things; I would aſk ſuch perſons ſeriouſly, if they could have produced calamities comparable to thoſe I have juſt related?

" ſacra alio ritu, & populari lingua celebrare; non denique " Pontifici aut Epiſcopis honorem deferre, ſed quoſdam è ſuo " numero delectos pro antiſtibus & doctoribus habere. Hæc " uti ad Franciſcum relata VI." Id. Feb. anni, &c.

Madame de Cental, who was proprietor of part of the lands thus laid waſte and drenched in the blood of their quondam inhabitants, applied for redreſs to Henry II. who referred her to the parliament of Paris. The ſolicitor-general of Provence, whoſe name was Guerin, and had been the principal author of the maſſacres, was condemned to loſe his head; and was the only one who ſuffered on this occaſion, the puniſhment due to the other accomplices in his guilt; becauſe, ſays De Thou, *aulicorum favore deſtitueretur*, he had no friends at court.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Whether TOLERATION is dangerous; and among what Nations it is practiſed.

SOME people will have it, that if we were to make uſe of humanity and indulgence towards our miſtaken brethren who pray to God in bad French, it would be putting arms into their hands, and we ſhould ſee revived the bloody days of Jarnac, Moncontour, Coutras, Dreux, St. Denis, &c. I know not how this may be, as I have not the gift of prophecy; but I really cannot diſcover the congruity of this reaſoning, "That becauſe theſe men took up arms againſt me "when I oppreſſed them, they will do the ſame if I "ſhew them favour."

And here I would willingly take the liberty to intreat thoſe who have the reins of government in hand, or are deſtined to fill the higheſt ſtations, for once to examine maturely, whether there is any reaſon to apprehend, that indulgence would occaſion the ſame rebellions as cruelty and oppreſſion; and whether, what has happened under certain circumſtances, would happen under others of a different nature; or whether times, opinions, and manners are always the ſame?

The Hugonots, it cannot be denied, have formerly given into all the rage of enthuſiaſm, and have been polluted with blood as well as ourſelves: but can it be ſaid, that the preſent generation is as barbarous as the former? Have not time and reaſon, that have lately made ſo great progreſs, together with good books, and that natural ſoftneſs introduced from ſociety, found their way among thoſe who have the guidance of theſe people? And do we not clearly perceive that almoſt all Europe has undergone a change within the laſt century?

The hands of government have every where been ſtrengthened, while the minds of the people have been ſoftened and civilized; the general police, ſupported by

by numerous ſtanding armies, leave us no longer any cauſe to fear the return of thoſe times of anarchy, when proteſtant boors and catholic peaſants were haſtily called together from the labours of agriculture, to wield the ſword againſt each others lives.

Alia tempora, aliæ curæ. It would be highly abſurd in the preſent days to decimate the body of the Sorbonne, becauſe it formerly petitioned for the burning the *Pucelle d'Orleans*; becauſe it declared Henry III. to have loſt his right to the throne, and becauſe it excommunicated and proſcribed the illuſtrious Henry IV. We ſhould not certainly think of proſecuting the other public bodies of the nation, who committed the like exceſſes in thoſe times of error and madneſs; it would not only be very unjuſt, but as ridiculous as if we were to oblige all the inhabitants of Marſeilles to undergo a courſe of phyſic, becauſe they had the plague in 1720.

Should we at preſent go and ſack Rome, as the troops of Charles the Fifth did, becauſe pope Sixtus the Fifth, in the year 1585, granted a nine years indulgence to all Frenchmen who who would take up arms againſt their ſovereign? No, ſurely it is enough, if we prevent the court of Rome from ever being guilty of ſuch exceſſes for the future.

The rage inſpired by a ſpirit of controverſy, and the abuſe made of the Chriſtian religion from want of properly underſtanding it, has occaſioned as much bloodſhed, and produced as many calamities in Germany, England, and even in Holland, as in France; and yet, at preſent, the difference in religion occaſions no diſturbances in thoſe countries: but the Jew, the Catholic, the Lutheran, the Calviniſt, the Anabaptiſt, the Socinian, the Moravian, and a multitude of other ſects, live in brotherly harmony together, and contribute equally to the good of ſociety.

In Holland, they no longer fear that the diſputations of a Gomar * concerning predeſtination, ſhould bring the

* Francis Gomar was a proteſtant divine; he maintained, in contradiction to Arminius his colleague, that God has, from all eternity, predeſtinated the greateſt part of mankind to burn in everlaſting

the head of a grand penſionary to the block: nor in London, that the quarrels between the Preſbyterians and the Epiſcopals about a form of prayer and a ſurplice, ſhould again ſpill the blood of their kings upon a ſcaffold †. Ireland, now populous and rich, will not any more behold its catholic inhabitants ſacrificing, as an acceptable offering, the lives of their proteſtant brethren, by burying them alive, hanging up mothers upon gibbets, and tying their daughters round their necks to ſee them expire together; ripping up women with child, taking the half-formed infants from the womb, and throwing them to ſwine or dogs to be devoured; putting a dagger into the hands of their manacled priſoners, and forcing them to plunge it into the breaſts of their fathers, their mothers, their wives, or children, thereby hoping to make them guilty of parricide, and damn

everlaſting flames: this infernal doctrine was ſupported in the manner moſt ſuitable to it, by perſecution. The grand penſionary Barneveldt, who was of the party which oppoſed Gomar, was beheaded on the 13th of May, 1619, at the age of ſeventy-two, *for having* (ſaid his ſentence) *uſed his uttermoſt endeavours to vex the church of God.*

† A pompous writer, in his apology for the revocation of the edict of Nantes, ſpeaking of England, has theſe words: "Theſe "were the natural fruits of a falſe religion; there remained "only one to be brought to perfection, which theſe iſlanders, juſtly "the contempt of all nations, have cheriſhed, and adopted to "themſelves." Certainly this author has been a little unfortunate in chooſing his time for repreſenting the Engliſh as a people deſpicable and deſpiſed by all the world: for ſurely, when a nation gives the moſt ſignal proofs of its bravery and generoſity, and when its victorious enſigns wave in the four parts of the world, no great credit is to be given to the writer who ſhall repreſent it as contemptible and contemned. But we muſt obſerve, that it is in a chapter in favour of perſecution, that we meet with this extraordinary paſſage; and none but ſuch who preach up perſecution can write thus. This deteſtable book, which ſeems the work of a madman, was compoſed by a perſon who has no eccleſiaſtical cure; for what real paſtor would write in ſuch a manner? The author has even carried his enthuſiaſtic fury to ſuch a length, as to juſtify the maſſacre of St. Bartholomew. It might be ſuppoſed, that a production, full of ſuch ſhocking paradoxes, would be in the hands of almoſt every one, were it only on account of its ſingularity, and yet it ſeems to be hardly known.

damn their ſouls while they deſtroyed their bodies: all which we find related by Rapin, who ſerved as an officer in the Engliſh ſervice in Ireland, and who lived very near the time of thoſe tranſactions, and confirmed by moſt of the Engliſh hiſtorians. No! ſuch cruelties, as theſe, were never to be paralled, ſo they doubtleſs will never be imitated. Philoſophy, the ſiſter of Religion, has herſelf ſnatched the poignard from the hands of Superſtition, ſo long bathed in blood; and the human underſtanding, recovered from its delirium, ſtands amazed at the ſhocking brutalities into which it has been hurried by enthuſiaſm.

We ourſelves know, that in France there is a rich and populous province, where the proteſtant religion prevails much more than that of the church of Rome. The univerſity of Alſace conſiſts almoſt entirely of Lutherans, and they are likewiſe in poſſeſſion of moſt of the civil poſts in that province; and yet the public peace has never once been diſturbed by any quarrels about religion, ſince that province has belonged to our kings. And what is the reaſon? Becauſe no one is perſecuted there on account of their religion. Seek not to lay a reſtraint upon the mind, and you may always be ſure that the mind will be yours.

I do not mean by this to inſinuate, that thoſe who are of a different faith to the prince under whoſe government they live, ſhould have an equal ſhare in the places of profits and honour, with thoſe who are of the eſtabliſhed religion of the ſtate. In England, the Roman catholics, who are in general looked upon to be friends to the Pretender, are excluded from all civil employs, and are even double taxed; but then, in every other reſpect, they enjoy the prerogative of citizens.

Some of our biſhops in France have been ſuſpected of thinking that their honour and intereſt is concerned, in not ſuffering any proteſtants within their dioceſe, and that this is the principal obſtacle to allowing of toleration amongſt us; but this I cannot believe. The epiſcopal body in France is compoſed of perſons of quality, who think and act in a manner ſuitable to their high birth; and as Envy itſelf muſt confeſs that they are both

both generous and charitable, they therefore certainly cannot think that thoſe, whom they thus drive out of their dioceſe, would become converts in any other country, but great honour would redound from the converſion of them at home; nor would the prelate be any loſer by it in his temporals, ſeeing, that the greater the number of the inhabitants, the greater is the value of the land.

A certain Poliſh biſhop had a farmer, who was an Anabaptiſt; and a receiver of his rents, who was a Socinian. Some perſon propoſed to the biſhop to proſecute the latter in the ſpiritual court, for not believing in tranſubſtantiation, and to turn the other out of his farm, becauſe he would not have his ſon chriſtened till he was fifteen years of age; the prelate very prudently replied, That though he made no doubt of their being eternally damned in the next world, yet he found them extremely neceſſary to him in this.

Let us now for a while quit our own little ſphere, and take a ſurvey of the reſt of the globe. The grand ſeignior peaceably rules over ſubjects of twenty different religions; upwards of two hundred thouſand Greeks live unmoleſted within the walls of Conſtantinople; the Mufti himſelf nominates the Greek patriarch, and preſents him to the emperor; and, at the ſame time, allows of the reſidence of a Latin patriarch. The ſultan appoints Latin biſhops for ſome of the Greek iſles; the form uſed on this occaſion is as follows*: "I command ſuch a one to go and reſide as "biſhop in the iſle of Chios, according to the antient "cuſtom and idle ceremonies of thoſe people." The Othman empire ſwarms with Jacobines, Neſtorians, Monothelites, Cophti, Chriſtians of St. John, Guebres, and Banians; and the Turkiſh annals do not furniſh us with one ſingle inſtance of a rebellion occaſioned by any of theſe different ſects.

Go into India, Perſia, and Tartary, and you will meet with the ſame toleration and the ſame tranquillity. Peter the Great encouraged all kinds of religions throughout his vaſt empire: trade and agriculture have been

* See Ricaut.

been gainers by it, and no injury ever happened therefrom to the body politic.

We do not find that the Chineſe government, during the courſe of four thouſand years that it has ſubſiſted, has ever adopted any other religion than that of the Noachides, which conſiſts in the ſimple worſhip of one God; and yet it tolerates the ſuperſtitions of Fo, and that of a multitude of bonzes; which might be productive of dangerous conſequences, did not the wiſdom of the tribunals keep them within proper bounds.

It is true, that the great Young-T-Chin, the moſt wiſe and magnanimous of all the emperors of China, drove the jeſuits out of his kingdom; but this was not becauſe that prince himſelf was non-tolerant, but, on the contrary, becauſe the jeſuits were ſo. They themſelves, in their letters, have given us the ſpeech the emperor made to them on that occaſion: "I know, "ſays he, that your religion admits not of toleration; "I know how you have behaved in the Manillas and at "Japan; you deceived my father, but think not to "deceive me in the ſame manner." And if we read the whole of the converſation which he deigned to hold with them, we muſt confeſs him to be the wiſeſt and moſt clement of all princes. How could he indeed, with any conſiſtency, keep in his kingdom European philoſophers, who, under the pretence of teaching the uſe of thermometers and œolypiles, had found means to debauch a prince of the blood? But what would this emperor have ſaid, had he read our hiſtories; and had he been acquainted with the times of the league and the gunpowder plot?

It was ſufficient for him to be informed of the outrageous and indecent diſputes between thoſe Jeſuits, Dominicans, Capuchins, and ſecular prieſts, who were ſent as miſſionaries into his dominions from one extremity of the globe to preach up truth; inſtead of which, they employed their time in mutually pronouncing damnation againſt each other. The emperor, then, did no more than ſend away a ſet of foreigners, who were diſturbers of the public peace. But with what infinite goodneſs did he diſmiſs them! and with what

paternal care did he provide for their accommodation in their journey, and to prevent their meeting with any inſult on their way! This very act of baniſhment might ſerve as an example of toleration and humanity.

* The Japoneſe were the moſt tolerant of all nations; twelve different religions were peaceably eſtabliſhed in their empire: when the Jeſuits came, they made the thirteenth; and, in a very little time after their arrival, they would not ſuffer any other but their own. Every one knows the conſequence of theſe proceedings: a civil war, as calamitous as that of the league, ſoon ſpread deſtruction and carnage through the empire; till at length the Chriſtian religion was itſelf ſwallowed up in the torrents of blood it had ſet a flowing, and the Japoneſe for ever ſhut the entrance of their country againſt all foreigners, looking upon us as no better than ſavage beaſts, ſuch as thoſe from which the Engliſh have happily cleared their iſland. Colbert, the miniſter, who knew the neceſſity we were in of the commodities of Japan, that wants nothing from us, laboured in vain to ſettle a trade with that empire; he found thoſe people inflexible.

Thus then every thing on our continent ſhows us, that we ought neither to preach up, nor to exerciſe non-toleration.

Let us now caſt our eyes on the other hemiſphere. Behold Carolina! whoſe laws were framed by the wiſe Locke; there every maſter of a family, who has only ſeven ſouls under his roof, may eſtabliſh what religion he pleaſes, provided all thoſe ſeven perſons concur with him therein; and yet this great indulgence has not, hitherto, been the occaſion of any diſorders. God forbid, that I ſhould mention this as an example to every maſter of a family to ſet up a particular worſhip in his houſe: I have only introduced it to ſhew, that the utmoſt lengths to which toleration can be carried, have never yet given riſe even to the ſlighteſt diſſentions.

And what ſhall we ſay of thoſe pacific primitive Chriſtians, who have, by way of deriſion, been called Quakers:

* See Kempfer, and all the accounts of Japan.

Quakers: and who, though ſome of their cuſtoms may perhaps be ridiculous, are yet remarkable for the virtue and ſobriety of their lives, and for having in vain endeavoured to preach peace and good-will to the reſt of mankind? There are at leaſt an hundred thouſand of them in Penſylvania; diſcord and controverſy are unknown in that happy ſpot where they are ſettled: the very name of their principal city, Philadelphia, is a continual memento to them, that all men are brethren, and is at once an example and reproach to thoſe nations who have not yet adopted toleration.

To conclude, toleration has never yet excited civil wars; whereas its oppoſite has filled the earth with ſlaughter and deſolation. Let any one judge, which of the two is moſt entitled to our eſteem, or which we ſhould applaud, the mother who would deliver her ſon into the hand of the executioner, or ſhe who would reſign all right to him to ſave his life.

In all which I have ſaid, I have had only the intereſt of nations in view, and, as I pay all due reſpect to the doctrines of the church, I have, in this article, only conſidered the phyſical and moral advantages of ſociety. I therefore hope, that every impartial reader will properly weigh theſe truths, that he will view them in their proper light, and rectify what may be amiſs. Thoſe who read with attention, and reciprocally communicate their thoughts, will always have the ſtart of the author *.

* Mr. de la Bourdonnaie, intendant of Rouen, ſays, that the manufacture for hats at Coudebec and Neufchatel is greatly fallen off ſince the refugees left that country. Mr. Foucaut, intendant of Caen, ſays, that trade in general is declined thro' the whole generality; and Mr. de Maupeou, intendant of Poitiers, that the manufacture for druggets is quite loſt. Mr. de Bezons complains, that there is now hardly any trade ſtirring at Clerac and Nerac. Mr. Miroménil, intendant of Tourain, ſays, that the trade of Tours is diminiſhed near ten millions per annum, and all this through the perſecution raiſed in that part of the kingdom: *See the memorials of the intendants in the year* 1698. To this if we add the number of land and ſea officers, and common ſailors, who have been forced to engage in foreign ſervices, frequently with fatal conſequences to their own country:

CHAP. V.

In what Caſes TOLERATION may be admitted.

LET me for once ſuppoſe, that a miniſter equally noble and diſcerning, that a prelate equally wiſe and humane, or a prince who is ſenſible that his intereſt conſiſts in the increaſed number of his ſubjects, and his glory in their happineſs, may deign to caſt their eyes on this random and defective production. In this caſe, his own conſummate knowledge will naturally lead him to aſk himſelf, what hazard ſhall I run by ſeeing the land beautified and enriched by a greater number of induſtrious labourers, the aids augmented, and the ſtate rendered more flouriſhing?

Germany, by this time, would have been a deſert, covered with the unburied bodies of many different ſects, ſlaughtered by each other, had not the peace of Weſtphalia happily procured a liberty of conſcience.

We have Jews at Bourdeaux, at Mentz, and in Alſace; we have Lutherans, Moliniſts, and Janſeniſts amongſt us; can we not then admit proteſtants likewiſe under proper reſtrictions, nearly like thoſe under which the Roman catholics are permitted in England? The greater the number of different ſects, the leſs danger is to be apprehended from any one in particular; they become weaker in proportion as they are more numerous, and are eaſily kept in ſubjection by thoſe juſt laws which prohibit riotous aſſemblies, mutual inſults, and ſeditions and which the legiſlative power will always properly ſupport in their full vigour.

We

try: we ſhall then ſee whether or no perſecution has been fatal to the ſtate.

We will not here preſume to offer any hints to thoſe miniſters, whoſe conduct and capacity are ſufficiently known, and whoſe greatneſs of ſoul and nobleneſs of ſentiment do honour to their illuſtrious birth: they will of themſelves readily perceive, that the reſtoration of our marine will require ſome indulgence at leaſt to be ſhewn to the inhabitants of our ſea-coaſts.

We know that there are ſeveral heads of families, who have acquired great fortunes in foreign countries, who would be glad to return to their native country. Theſe require only the protection of the law of nature, to have their marriages to remain valid, and their children ſecured in the enjoyment of their preſent property, and the right of ſucceeding to the inheritance of their fathers, together with a protection for their perſons. They aſk no public places of worſhip; they aim not at the poſſeſſion of civil employs, nor do they aſpire to dignities either in church or ſtate; for no Roman catholics can enjoy any of theſe, either in England or in any other proteſtant country. In this caſe, therefore, there is no occaſion for granting great privileges, or delivering ſtrong holds into the hands of a faction, but only ſuffer a quiet ſet of people to breathe their native air; to ſoften the rigour of ſome edicts, which in former times might perhaps have been neceſſary, but at preſent are no longer ſo. It is not for us to direct the miniſtry what it has to do; it is ſufficient, if we preſume to plead the cauſe of an unfortunate and diſtreſſed people.

Many and eaſy are the methods to render theſe people uſeful to the ſtate, and to prevent them from ever becoming dangerous: the wiſdom of the legiſlature, ſupported by the military force, will certainly find out theſe methods, which other nations have employed with ſo much ſucceſs.

It is certain, that there is ſtill a number of enthuſiaſts among the lower kind of Calviniſts; but, on the other hand, it is no leſs certain, that there is ſtill a greater number among the lower kind of bigotted Roman Catholics. The dregs of the madmen of St. Medard are paſſed over unnoticed in the nation, while the greateſt pains are taken to exterminate the Calviniſt prophets. The moſt certain means to leſſen the number of the mad of both ſorts, if any ſtill remain, is to leave them entirely to the care of reaſon, which will infallibly enlighten the underſtanding in the long run, though ſhe may be ſlow in her operations. Reaſon goes mildly to work, ſhe perſuades with humanity, ſhe inſpires mu-

tual indulgence and forbearance; ſhe ſtifles the voice of diſcord, eſtabliſhes the rule of virtue and ſobriety, and diſpoſes thoſe to pay a ready obedience to the laws, who might ſtart from the hand of power when exerted to enforce them. Beſides, are we to hold for nothing that contempt and ridicule which enthuſiaſm every where meets with in the preſent enlightened age, from perſons of rank and education? This very contempt is the moſt powerful barrier that can be oppoſed to the extravagancies of all ſectaries. Paſt times are as though they never had been. We ſhould always direct our views from the point where we ourſelves at preſent are, and from that to which other nations have attained.

There has been a time, in which it was thought a duty to iſſue edicts againſt all ſuch who taught a doctrine contrary to the categories of Ariſtotle, or who oppoſed the abhorrence of a vacuum, quiddities, or the whole of the part of a thing. There are above an hundred volumes in Europe, containing the writings of civilians againſt magic, and the manner of diſtinguiſhing real ſorcerers from pretended ones. The excommunication of graſhhoppers and other inſects hurtful to the fruits of the earth, was formerly much in uſe, and is ſtill to be found in ſeveral rituals; that cuſtom is now laid aſide, and Ariſtotle with his ſorcerers and the graſhoppers are left to themſelves. Innumerable are the examples of theſe grave follies, which formerly were deemed of great importance; others have ſucceeded from time to time, but as ſoon as they have had their effect, and people begin to grow weary of them, they paſs away and are no more heard of. If any one was at preſent, to take it into his head to turn Eutichean, Neſtorian, or Manichean, what would be the conſequence? We ſhould laugh at him in the ſame manner as at a perſon who ſhould appear dreſſed after the antient faſhion, with a great ruff and ſlaſhed ſleeves.

The firſt thing that opened the eyes of our nation was, when the Jeſuits Le Tellier and Doucin drew up the bull Unigenitus, and ſent it to the court of Rome, imagining they lived ſtill in thoſe times of ignorance, in which

which people adopted, without examination, the moſt abſurd aſſertions. They even dared to proſcribe a propoſition, which is univerſally true in all caſes and in all times, *viz.* "That the dread of an unjuſt excommu-"nication ought not to hinder any one from his duty," This was, in fact, proſcribing reaſon, the liberties of the Gallican church, and the very foundation of all morality; it was ſaying to mankind, "God commands you "never to do your duty, when you are apprehenſive of "ſuffering any injuſtice." Never ſure was ſo groſs an inſult offered to common ſenſe, and yet this never occurred to theſe correſpondents of the church of Rome. Nay, they even perſuaded that court, that this bull was neceſſary, that the nation deſired it. Accordingly it it was ſigned, ſealed, and ſent back to France; and every one knows the conſequences: aſſuredly, had they been foreſeen, this bull would have been mitigated. Very warm diſputes enſued upon it; but however, by the great prudence and goodneſs of the king, they were at length appeaſed.

It is much the ſame with regard to moſt of thoſe points, in which the proteſtants and we at preſent differ ſome of them are of little or no conſequence, others again are more ſerious; but even in theſe latter, the rage of diſputation is ſo far ſubſided that the proteſtants now-a-days no longer preach upon controverſial points in any of their churches.

Let us then ſeize this period of diſguſt or ſatiety for ſuch matters, or rather indeed, of the prevalence of reaſon, as an epocha for reſtoring the public tranquillity, of which it ſeems to be a pleaſing earneſt. Controverſy, that epidemical malady is now in its decline, and requires nothing more than a gentle regimen. In a word, it is the intereſt of the ſtate, that theſe wandering ſects, who have ſo long lived as aliens to their father's houſe, on their returning in a ſubmiſſive and peaceable manner, ſhould meet with a favourable reception; humanity ſeems to demand this, reaſon adviſes it, and good policy can have nothing to apprehend from it.

CHAP. VI.

If NON-TOLERATION is agreeable to the law of NATURE and of SOCIETY.

THE law of nature is that which nature points out to all mankind. You have brought up a child, that child owes you a reſpect as its parent, and gratitude as its benefactor. You have a right over the productions of the earth which you have raiſed by the labour of your own hands; you have given and received a promiſe, that promiſe ought to be kept.

The law of ſociety can have no other foundation in any caſe than on the law of nature. "Do not that to another which thou wouldeſt not he ſhould do unto thee", is the great and univerſal principle of both throughout the earth: now, agreeable to this principle, can one man ſay to another, "Believe that which "I believe, and which thou thyſelf can'ſt not believe, "or thou ſhalt die?" And yet this is what is every day ſaid in Portugal, in Spain, and at Goa. In ſome other counties indeed, they now content themſelves with ſaying, "Believe as I do, or I will hold thee in abhorrence; "believe like me, or I will do thee all the evil I can: "wretch, thou art not of my religion, and therefore "thou haſt no religion at all, and oughteſt to be held "in execration by thy neighbours, thy city, and thy "province."

If the law of ſociety directs ſuch a conduct, the Japaneſe ought then to hold the Chineſe in deteſtation; the latter the Siameſe, who ſhould perſecute the inhabitants of the Ganges; and they fall upon thoſe of India; the Mogul ſhould put to death the firſt Malabar he found in his kingdom; the Malabar ſhould poigniard the Perſian; the Perſian maſſacre the Turk; and all together ſhould fall upon us Chriſtians, who have ſo many ages been cutting one another's throats.

The law of perſecution then is equally abſurd and barbarous; it is the law of tygers: nay, it is even ſtill more

more ſavage, for tygers deſtroy only for the ſake of food, whereas we have butchered one another on account of a ſentence or a paragraph.

CHAP. VII.

If NON-TOLERATION was known among the GREEKS.

THE ſeveral nations, with which hiſtory has made us in part acquainted, did all conſider their different religions as ties by which they were united; it was the aſſociation of human kind. There was a kind of law of hoſpitality among the Gods, the ſame as amongſt men. If a ſtranger arrived in any town, the firſt thing he did was to pay his adoration to the Gods of the country, even though they were the Gods of his enemies. The Trojans offered up prayers even to thoſe Gods who fought for the Greeks.

Alexander made a journey into the deſerts of Lybia, purpoſely to conſult the God Ammon, to whom the Greeks gave the name of *Zeus*, and the Latins that of Jupiter, though both countries had their Jupiter and their *Zeus* amongſt themſelves. When they ſat down before any town or city, they offered up ſacrifices and prayers to the gods of that city or town, to render them propitious to their undertaking. Thus, even in the midſt of war, religion united mankind: and though it might ſometimes prompt them to exerciſe the moſt inhuman cruelties, at other times it frequently ſoftened their fury.

I may be miſtaken, but it appears to me, that not one of all the civilized nations of antiquity ever laid a reſtraint upon liberty of thinking. They had all a particular religion; but they ſeemed to have acted in this reſpect towards men in the ſame manner as they did towards their Gods; they all acknowledged one ſupreme Being, though they aſſociated with him an infinite number of inferior deities: in like manner, though they

had but one faith, yet they admitted a multitude of particular ſyſtems.

The Greeks, for example, though a very religious people, were not offended with the Epicureans, who denied Providence and the exiſtence of the ſoul; not to mention divers other ſects, whoſe tenets were all of them repugnant to the pure ideas we ought to entertain of a Creator, and yet were all of them tolerated.

Socrates, who came the neareſt to the knowledge of the true God, is ſaid to have ſuffered on that account, and died a martyr to the Deity; he was the only one whom the Greeks ever put to death on account of opinion. If this was really the cauſe of his being condemned, it does very little honour to perſecution, ſince he was put to death for being the only one who gave true glory to God, whilſt thoſe who taught notions the moſt unworthy of the Deity were held in high honour: therefore, I think, the enemies of toleration ſhould be cautious how they lay a ſtreſs upon the infamous example of his judges.

Moreover, it is evident from hiſtory, that he fell a victim to the revenge of an enraged party. He had made himſelf many inveterate enemies of the ſophiſts, orators, and poets, who taught in the public ſchools, and even of all the preceptors who had the care of the children of diſtinction. He himſelf acknowledges in his diſcourſe handed down to us by Plato, that he went from houſe to houſe, to convince theſe preceptors, that they were a ſet of ignorant fellows; a conduct certainly unworthy of one who had been declared by an oracle the wiſeſt of mankind. A prieſt, and one of the members of the Areopagus, were let looſe upon him, who accuſed him I cannot preciſely ſay of what, as his apology to me ſeems very vague; from which however we learn in general, that he was charged with inſpiring the youth of the nation with notions contrary to the religion and government of the country: an accuſation which the ſlanderers of all times and places have conſtantly made uſe of; but a court of juſtice requires poſitive facts, and that the charge ſhould be circumſtantial and well ſupported, none of which are to be found in the

the proceedings againſt Socrates. All we know is, that he had at firſt two hundred and twenty voices for him; therefore, there muſt have been two hundred and twenty out of the five hundred judges, who were philoſophers; a great many more, I believe, than are to be found any where elſe. At length, however, the majority were for the hemlock potion. But here let us not forget, that when the Athenians came to their reaſon, they held both his accuſers and judges in deteſtation; made Melitus, who had been the principal author of the ſentence pronounced againſt him, pay for that act of injuſtice with his life; baniſhed all the others that were concerned in it, and erected a temple to Socrates. Never was philoſophy ſo nobly revenged, ſo highly honoured. This affair of Socrates then is, in fact, the moſt powerful argument that can be alledged againſt perſecution. The Athenians had an altar dedicated to the ſtrange Gods, Gods they could never know. What ſtronger proof then can there be, not only of their extreme indulgence towards all nations, but even for their reſpect for the religion of thoſe nations?

A very worthy perſon, who is neither an enemy to reaſon, learning, or probity, nor to his country, in undertaking to juſtify the affair of the maſſacre of St. Bartholomew, quotes the war of the Phocians, by them called *the ſacred war*, as if that war had been entered into on the ſcore of religion, or a particular point in divinity; whereas it is well known, that it was cauſed by a diſpute about a particular ſpot of ground, the conſtant cauſe of all wars. A few corn-grounds can certainly never be a ſymbol of belief; it is as certain, that none of the Greek cities ever made war upon each other from the ſake of opinion. After all, what would this modeſt and humane writer drive at? Would he have us undertake a ſacred war?

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Whether the ROMANS encouraged TOLERATION.

AMONG the antient Romans, from the days of Romulus to thoſe in which the Chriſtians began to diſpute with the prieſts of the empire, we do not find a ſingle inſtance of any perſon being perſecuted on account of his ſentiments. Cicero doubted every thing; Lucretius denied every thing; and yet, neither one nor the other underwent the leaſt reproach from their fellow citizens: nay, ſo far did this licence go, that Pliny the naturaliſt begins his book by denying the exiſtence of a God, and ſaying, That if there is one, it muſt be the ſun. Cicero, in ſpeaking of hell, ſays, *Non eſt unus tam excors quæ credat.* "There is not even an "old woman ſo ſilly as to believe it." Juvenal ſays, *Nec pueri credunt:* "Even our children laugh at it." And the following maxim was publicly repeated on the Roman theatre: *Poſt mortem nihil eſt, ipſaque mors nihil:* "nought after death, even death itſelf is nought." While we abhor thoſe maxims, let us pardon them in a people, who were never enlightened by the holy truths of the goſpel; and, while we own them to be falſe and impious, let us however confeſs, that the Romans were great friends to toleration, ſeeing that ſuch tenets never excited any commotions.

Deorum offenſa diis curæ, was the grand principle of the ſenate and people of Rome; that illuſtrious nation employing their attention wholly to conquer, govern, and civilize the univerſe. They were our legiſlators as well as our conquerors; and even Cæſar, who reduced us to his ſubjection, and gave us laws and games, never attempted to compel us to quit our Druids for him, though ſupreme pontiff of a nation, whoſe ſubjects we were now become.

The Romans themſelves did not profeſs all kinds of religion, therefore they did not give public ſanction to all, but they permitted them. Under Numa, nothing material

material was the object of their worſhip. They had neither ſtatues nor pictures; in proceſs of time, however, ſome were erected to the *Dii Majorum Gentium*, with which the Greeks brought them acquainted. That law in the twelve tables, *Deos peregrinos ne colunto*, was confined to the allowing no public worſhip to be paid, except to the ſuperior and inferior deities, approved by the ſenate. The Egyptian goddeſs Iſis had a temple in Rome to the time of Tiberius, who demoliſhed it, becauſe its prieſts, having been bribed by Mundus, ſuffered him to lie with a lady called Paulina in the temple itſelf, under the name and form of the God Anubis. Indeed this ſtory is to be found only in Joſephus, who did not live at that time; and was moreover a credulous and exaggerating writer: and there is very little probability, that in ſo enlightened an age as that of Tiberius, a lady of the firſt diſtinction in Rome could be ſo weak as to believe that a God cohabited with her.

But whether this anecdote be true or falſe, this one thing is certain, that the Egyptian idolatry was in the poſſeſſion of a temple at Rome with the public conſent. The jews had alſo lived as traders in that city ever ſince the Punic war; they had their ſynagogues there in the time of Auguſtus, and almoſt always continued to have them in the ſame manner as they now have in modern Rome. Can we deſire a ſtronger inſtance, that the Romans looked upon toleration as the moſt ſacred of all the laws of nations?

We are told, that as ſoon as the Chriſtian religion began to make its appearance, its followers were perſecuted by theſe very Romans who perſecuted no one. This fact, however, appears to me to be evidently falſe, and I deſire no better authority than that of St. Paul himſelf. In the acts of the Apoſtles *, we are told, that St. Paul being accuſed by the Jews, of attempting to overturn the Moſaic law by that of Jeſus Chriſt, St. James propoſed to him to ſhave his head, and go into the temple with four Jews, and purify himſelf with them, "That all men may know, ſays he, that thoſe

"things

* Chap. 21. 22.

" things, whereof they were informed concerning thee, " are nothing, but that thou thyſelf doſt keep the law " of Moſes."

Accordingly, we find that St. Paul, though a Chriſtian, ſubmitted to perform theſe Jewiſh ceremonies for the ſpace of ſeven days; but before the expiration of this time, the Jews of Aſia, who knew him again, ſeeing him in the temple, not only with Jews but Gentiles alſo, cried out, that he had polluted the holy place, and laid hands upon him, drew him out of the temple, and carried him before the governor Felix: they afterwards accuſed him at the judgment-ſeat of Feſtus, whither the Jews came in crowds demanding his death. But Feſtus anſwered them, " It is not " the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to " die, before that he which is accuſed have the ac- " cuſers face to face, and have licence to anſwer for " himſelf *."

Theſe words of the Roman magiſtrate are more remarkable, as he appears to have been no favourer of St. Paul, but rather to have held him in contempt, for, impoſed upon by the falſe lights of his own reaſon, he took him for a perſon beſides himſelf; nay, he expreſsly ſays, to him, " Much learning hath made " thee mad †." Feſtus then was entirely guided by the equity of the Roman law, in taking under his protection a ſtranger, for whom he could have no regard.

Here then we have the word of God itſelf declaring, that the Romans were a juſt people, and no perſecutors. Beſides, it was not the Romans who laid violent hands on St. Paul, but the Jews. St. James, the brother of Jeſus, was ſtoned to death by order of a Sadducee Jew, and not by that of a Roman judge: it was the Jews alone who put St. Stephen to death ‡; and though St. Paul held the clothes of thoſe

* Acts 25. † ibid. 26.

‡ Though the power of life and death in criminal matters had been taken from the Jews after the baniſhment of Archelaus into the country of the Allobroges, and that Judea had been governed as a province; nevertheleſs, the Romans frequently winked

thoſe who ſtoned him, he certainly did not act then as a Roman citizen.

The primitive Chriſtians had certainly no cauſe or complaint againſt the Romans; the Jews, from whom they at that time began to ſeparate themſelves, were their only enemies. Every one knows the implacable hatred all ſectaries bear to thoſe who quit their ſect. There, doubtleſs, were ſeveral tumults in the ſynagogues at Rome. Suetonius, in his life of Claudius, has theſe words, *Judæos impulſore Chriſto aſſidue tumultuantes Roma expulit.* He is wrong in ſaying, that it was at the inſtigation of Chriſt they raiſed commotions in Rome; but he could not be acquainted with all the circumſtances relating to a people who were held in ſuch contempt at Rome as the Jews were: and however miſtaken he may have been in this particular, yet he is right as to the occaſion of theſe commotions. Suetonius wrote in the reign of Adrian in the ſecond century, when the Chriſtians were not diſtinguiſhed from the Jews by the Romans: therefore this paſſage of Suetonius is a proof, that the Romans, ſo far from oppreſſing the primitive Chriſtians, chaſtiſed the Jews who perſecuted them, being deſirous that the Jewiſh ſynagogue at Rome ſhould ſhow the ſame indulgence to its diſſenting brethren, as it received itſelf from the Roman ſenate: and we find from Dion Caſſius and Ulpian, that the Jews, who were thus baniſhed from Rome, returned ſoon after, and even attained to ſeveral honours and dignities, notwithſtanding the laws which excluded them therefrom*. Can it be believed, that after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, the emperors would have loaded the Jews with their favours, and have perſecuted and put to death the Chriſtians, whom they looked upon as a ſect of the Jews?

Nero

winked at the exertion of a judicial power by theſe people on any particular occaſion that related merely to thoſe of their own ſect; ſuch as for inſtance, when in any ſudden tumult, they out of zeal ſtoned to death the perſon whom they thought guilty of blaſphemy.

* Ulpianus l. tit. II. *Eis qui judaicam ſuperſtitionem ſequuntur, honores adipiſci permiſerent, &c.*

Nero is ſaid to have been a great perſecutor of the Chriſtians. But Tacitus tells us, that they were accuſed with having ſet fire to the city of Rome, and were thereupon given up to the reſentment of the populace. But had religion any thing to do in this charge? No, certainly. We might as well ſay, that the Chineſe, whom the Dutch murdered a few years ago in Batavia, were ſlaughtered on account of their religion. And nothing but a ſtrong deſire to deceive ourſelves can poſſibly make us attribute to perſecution the ſufferings of a few half-Jews and half-Chriſtians under Nero *.

* Tacitus's words are: *Quos per flagitia inviſos vulgus Chriſtianos appellabat.*

It is hardly probable, that the name of Chriſtian was already known in Rome; Tacitus wrote in the reigns of the emperors Veſpaſian and Domitian; and he ſpeaks of the Chriſtians in the manner that it was cuſtomary in his time. And here I muſt venture to aſſert, that the words *Odio humani generis convicti*, may equally well be rendered agreeable to the ſtile of this writer, *Convicted of being hated by mankind, as convicted of hating all mankind.*

And indeed, what was the employment of theſe firſt miſſionaries at Rome? They laboured to gain a few proſelytes, by preaching up a pure and ſimple moral doctrine; the humility of their hearts, and the modeſty of their manners, were equal to the lowlineſs of their condition and circumſtances. Having been ſo lately ſeparated from the Jews, they were hardly known in the world as a different ſect; how then could they be hated by, or convicted of hating all mankind, to whom they were in a manner unknown?

The Roman Catholics have been accuſed as the incendiaries of the city of London in the year 1666, but not till they had firſt occaſioned civil wars on account of religion; and that ſeveral of that faith, though unworthy to be ſo, had been legally convicted of the Gunpowder Plot.

But ſurely the caſe of the primitive Chriſtians in the time of Nero was very different. It is no eaſy matter to clear up the obſcurities of hiſtory. Even Tacitus himſelf ſays nothing that can afford a reaſon to ſuſpect Nero of having ſet fire to Rome; and we might, with a greater appearance of probability, charge Charles II. with having lighted up the flames that laid London in aſhes, in revenge for the blood of his father, that had been ſo lately ſhed upon the ſcaffold, to ſatisfy a rebellious people who thirſted for that blood. Charles had at leaſt ſome excuſe for ſuch an action; whereas, Nero had neither excuſe, pretence, or

intereſt

intereſt for the deed attributed to him. Reports of this kind have been common in every country among the populace, and even our own times have furniſhed us with ſome equally falſe and ridiculous.

Tacitus, who was ſo well acquainted with the diſpoſition of princes, could not have been a ſtranger to that of the common people, who are ever vain, inconſtant, and violent in the opinions they adopt, incapable of diſcerning truth from falſhood, and ready to believe, aſſert, and forget every thing.

Philo ſays, "That Sejanus perſecuted the Jews under Tiberius, but that after the death of Sejanus, the emperor "re-inſtated them in all their privileges." One of which was, that of being denizens of Rome, notwithſtanding the contempt they were held in by the Romans. As ſuch they had a ſhare in the diſtribution of corn, and whenever ſuch diſtribution happened to he made on the day that was their ſabbath, the portion allotted them was put by till the next day: this indulgence might probably be granted them in favour of the great ſums of money with which they furniſhed the ſtate; for they have purchaſed toleration in every country at a pretty high rate, though, it muſt be confeſſed, that they have ſoon found means to reimburſe themſelves.

This paſſage of Philo clearly explains one in Tacitus, where he ſays, "That four thouſand Jews or Egyptians were baniſhed "to Sardinia, where, if they had all periſhed, thro' the badneſs of the climate, it would have been no great loſs." *Vile damnum.*

Before I cloſe this note, I ſhall obſerve, that Philo ſpeaks of Tiberius as a wiſe and juſt prince. I am very ready to believe, that he was ſo, only where the being ſuch was agreeable to his intereſt; but the good character given him here by Philo makes me, at the ſame time, greatly ſuſpect the truth of thoſe terrible crimes, with which Tacitus and Suetonius reproach him. Nor can I think it likely, that an infirm old man of ſeventy, would have retired into the iſland of Caprea, to indulge himſelf in the uninterrupted exerciſe of a refined debauchery, which appears to be hardly natural, and was, even in thoſe days of licentiouſneſs, unknown to the moſt abandoned of the Roman youth. Neither Tacitus nor Suetonius were acquainted with that emperor; but took theſe ſtories upon the credit of vulgar reports; Octavius and Tiberius Cæſar, and their ſucceſſors, had been juſtly deteſted for reigning over a free people without their conſent. All hiſtorians have taken a delight in beſpattering their characters, and the world has taken them upon their words for want of authentic memorials or chronicles in thoſe times. Beſides, as theſe writers do not quote any authority for what they advance, who could contradict them? They blackened whom they pleaſed, and wantonly directed the judgment of poſterity. The wiſe and impartial reader will, however,

however, readily perceive how far the veracity of hiſtorians is to be depended on, and what degree of credit is due to public facts atteſted by authors of reputation, born in a learned and enlightened nation, as well as what bounds to ſet to our belief of anecdotes, when related by theſe ſame authors, without any authority to ſupport them.

CHAP.

CAAP. IX.

Of MARTYRS.

SEVERAL Chriſtians afterwards ſuffered martyrdom; it is not eaſy to ſay on what particular account they were condemned; but I can venture to aſſert, that none ſuffered under the firſt Cæſars, merely on the account of religion, for they tolerated all beliefs; therefore, why ſhould they ſeek out and proſecute an obſcure people, who had a worſhip peculiar to themſelves, at the time they licenſed all others?

The emperors Titus, Trajan, Antoninus, and Decius, were not barbarians: how then can we imagine, that they would have deprived the Chriſtians alone of that liberty, with which they indulged every other nation; or, that they would even have troubled them for having concealed myſteries, while the worſhippers of Iſis, Mithra, and the Goddeſs of Aſſyria, whoſe rites were all of them equally unknown to the Romans, were ſuffered to perform them without hindrance? Certainly, the perſecutions the Chriſtians ſuffered, muſt have ariſen from other cauſes, and from ſome private pique, enforced by reaſons of ſtate.

For inſtance, when St. Laurence refuſed to deliver to Cornelius Secularius, the Roman prefect, the money belonging to the Chriſtians which he had in his cuſtody; was it not very natural for the prefect and the emperor to be incenſed at this refuſal? They did not know that St. Laurence had diſtributed this money among the poor, in acts of charity and benevolence; therefore they conſidered him only as a refractory perſon, and puniſhed him accordingly *.

Again,

* We moſt certainly have a proper deference for whatever the holy church has made the objects of our reverence; accordingly, we invoke the bleſſed martyrs: but at the ſame time that we pay St. Laurence all due reſpect, may we not be permitted to doubt that St. Sixtus ſaid to him, "You will follow "me

Again, let us conſider the martyrdom of St. Polyeuctes. Can he be ſaid to have ſuffered on account of religion only? He enters a temple, where the people are employed in offering thankſgivings to their Gods, on account of the victory gained by the emperor Decius; he inſults the prieſts, and overturns and breaks in pieces the altar and ſtatues; is there a country in the world where ſo groſs an inſult would have been paſſed over? The chriſtian who publicly tore the edict of the emperor Diocleſian, and by that act brought on the great perſecution againſt his brethren in the two laſt years of this prince's reign, had not, ſurely, a zeal according to knowledge, but was the unhappy cauſe of all the diſaſters that befel his party. This inconſiderate zeal, which was often breaking forth, and was condemned even by ſeveral of the fathers of church, was probably the occaſion of all thoſe perſecutions we read of.

Certainly, I would not make a compariſon between the firſt ſacramentarians and the primitive Chriſtians; as error ſhould never be ranked in the ſame claſs with truth: but it is well known, that Farrel, the predeceſſor of Calvin, did the very ſame thing at Arles, which St. Polyeuctes had done before him in Armenia. The townſmen were carrying the ſtatue of St. Anthony the hermit in proceſſion through the ſtreets; Farrel and ſome of his followers in a fit of zeal fell upon the monks who were carrying the image, beat them, made them take to their heels, and, having ſeized upon St. Anthony,

"me in three days." That, during this ſhort interval, the prefect of Rome made him demand a ſum of money of the Chriſtians; that Laurence had time to aſſemble all the poor people in that city; that he walked before the prefect, to ſhew him the place where they were aſſembled; that he was afterwards tried and condemned to the torture; that the prefect ordered the ſmith to make a grid-iron large enough to broil a man upon; that the principal magiſtrate of Rome aſſiſted in perſon at this ſtrange execution; and laſtly that St. Laurence, while upon the grid-iron, called out to him, "I am done enough on this "ſide, let them turn me on the other, if you have a mind to "eat me." This ſame grid-iron ſeems to have very little of the Roman genius in it; and beſides, how happens it that we do not find a word of this ſtory in any of the heathen writers?

Anthony, threw him into the river. Aſſuredly Farrel deſerved death for this flagrant outrage upon the public peace, but he had the good luck to eſcape by flight. Now, had he only told thoſe monks in the open ſtreets that he did not believe that a raven had brought half a loaf to St. Anthony, nor that his hermit had had converſation with centaurs and ſatyrs, he would have deſerved a ſeveſe reprimand for troubling the public peace; but if, the night after the proceſſion, he had quietly examined the ſtory in his own room, no one could have found any fault with him for it.

But indeed can we ſuppoſe, that the Romans, after permitting the infamous Antinoüs to be ranked among their demigods, would have maſſacred and thrown to wild beaſts thoſe againſt whom they had no other cauſe of reproach, than having peaceably worſhipped a juſt deity? Or, would thoſe very Romans, who worſhipped a ſupreme and all powerful God *, maſter of all the ſubordinate

* We have only to open Virgil to be convinced that the Romans acknowledged one Supreme Being, the lord and maſter of all other heavenly beings.

" O! qui res hominumque deûmque
" Æternis regis imperiis, & fulmine terres,
" O pater, ô hominum divûmque æterna poteſtas, &c.

And Horace expreſſes himſelf ſtill more ſtrongly:

" Unde nil majus generatur ipſo,
" Nec viget quidquam ſimile, aut ſecundum."

In thoſe myſteries into which almoſt all the Roman youth were initiated, nothing elſe was ſung but the unity of God. See the noble hymn of Orpheus, and the letter of Maximus of Modarum to St. Auguſtin, in which he ſays, " That none but fools can " poſſibly deny a Supreme Being." Longinus, who was an heathen, writes alſo to St. Auguſtine, " That God is one, in- " comprehenſible, ineffable." Even Lactantius, who certainly cannot be charged with being too indulgent, acknowledges in his fifth book, " That the Romans ſubjected all the other deities " to the one ſupreme God;" *illos ſubjecit & mancipat Deo.* Tertullian alſo in his apology confeſſes, " That the whole em- " pire acknowledged one God, ruler of the world, and infinite " in power and majeſty:" *Principem mundi perfectæ potentiæ & majeſtatis.* Again, if we look into Plato, who taught Cicero

ſubordinate deities, and diſtinguiſhed by the title of *Deus optimus maximus*; would they, I ſay, have perſecuted ſuch who profeſſed to worſhip one only God?

There appears little reaſon to believe that there ever was an inquiſition erected againſt the Chriſtians under the Roman emperors; I mean, that they were ever judicially examined on the ſubject of their faith; neither do we find, that Jew, Syrian, Egyptian bards, Druids, or philoſophers, were ever troubled on this account. The primitive martyrs then were men who oppoſed the worſhip of falſe gods. But, however wiſe or pious they might be in rejecting the belief of ſuch abſurd fictions; if, not content with worſhipping the true God in ſpirit and in truth, they offered a violent and public outrage to the received religion of the government under which they lived, however abſurd that religion might be; impartiality obliges us to confeſs, that they themſelves were the firſt perſecutors.

Tertullian, in his apology *, ſays, that the Chriſtians were looked upon as a turbulent and ſeditious ſect. This accuſation is doubtleſs unjuſt; but it ſerves to prove, that the civil power did not ſet itſelf againſt the Chriſtians purely on account of their religion. In another place † he ſays, that the Chriſtians refuſed to adorn the doors of their houſes with laurel branches on the days of public rejoicing for the victories of the emperors. Now this blameable particularity might, not without ſome reaſon, be taken for diſaffection to the government.

The firſt juridical act of ſeverity, we find exerciſed againſt the Chriſtians, was that of Domitian; but this extended only to baniſhment, which did not laſt above a year: for, ſays the author above quoted, *Facile cæptum repreſſit reſtitutis quos ipſe relegaverat.* Lactantius, ſo remarkable for his paſſionate and pompous ſtile, acknowledges that from the time of Domitian to that of Decius,

ro his philoſophy, we ſhall there find him thus expreſs himſelf: "There is but one God, whom we all ought to love and adore, "and labour to reſemble him in integrity and holineſs." Epictetus in a dungeon, and Mark Antoninus on a throne, tell us the ſame in a hundred different paſſages of their writings.

* Chap. 39. † Chap. 35.

Decius, the church continued in a peaceable and flouriſhing condition. This long tranquillity, ſays he *, was interrupted by that execrable animal Decius, who began to oppreſs the church: *Poſt multos annos extitit execrabile animal Decius qui vexaret eccleſiam.*

I ſhall not here enter into a diſcuſſion of the opinion of the learned Mr. Dodwell, concerning the ſmall number of martyrs; but if the Romans had been ſuch violent perſecutors of the Chriſtian religion; if their ſenate had condemned ſo many of its innocent votaries to periſh by the moſt unheard of tortures, plunging them alive in boiling oil, and expoſing their wives and daughters naked to the wild beaſts in the Circus, how happened it, that they ſuffered all the firſt biſhops of Rome to live unmoleſted? St. Ireneus reckons only one martyr among all theſe biſhops, namely, Teleſphorus, who ſuffered in the year 139 of our vulgar æra; nor have we any poſitive proof of this Teleſphorus being put to death. Zephirinus governed the flock at Rome for eighteen years ſucceſſively, and died peaceably in the year 219. It is true, that in the antient martyrologies, we find almoſt all the firſt popes ranked as martyrs; but the word *martyr* is there taken only in its original and and true ſignification, which is a *witneſs* and not a *ſufferer*.

Moreover we can hardly reconcile this rage of perſecution with the liberty granted the Chriſtians, of aſſembling no leſs than fifty-ſix councils in the courſe of the three firſt centuries, as is acknowledged by all eccleſiaſtical writers.

That there were perſecutions, is doubtleſs; but if they had been as violent as repreſented, it is hardly probable that Tertullian, who wrote with ſo much energy againſt the eſtabliſhed religion, would have been ſuffered to die peaceably in his bed. It is certain, that none of the emperors ever read his apology, as an obſcure work, compoſed in Africa, can hardly be ſuppoſed to have come into the hands of the governors of the world: but then, it might have been ſhewn to their proconſuls

* Chap. 3.

proconſuls in Africa, and have drawn down their reſentment upon the author: nevertheleſs, we do not find that he ſuffered martyrdom.

Origen taught the Chriſtian religion publicly in Alexandria, and yet was not put death for it. And this very Origen himſelf, who ſpoke with ſo much freedom both to the Heathens and to the Chriſtians, and who, while he taught Jeſus to the one, denied the triple Godhead to the other, expreſsly acknowledges in his third book againſt Celſus, "That there were very "few who ſuffered martyrdom, and thoſe at a great "diſtance of time from each other; notwithſtanding, "ſays he, that the chriſtians leave nothing undone to "make their religion generally embraced; running "from city to city, and from town to town, to make "converts."

It muſt be confeſſed, that theſe continual peregrinations might readily give cauſe to the prieſts who were their enemies, to accuſe them of a deſign to raiſe diſturbances; and yet we find, that theſe miſſions were tolerated even among the Egyptians, who have ever been a turbulent, factious, and mean people, and who tore a Roman to death for having killed a cat; in a word, a nation at all times contemptible, whatever may have been ſaid to the contrary by the admirers of pyramids *.

What perſon could do more to call down upon him the reſentment of both eccleſiaſtical and civil power than St. Gregory Taumaturgos the diſciple of Origen? This ſame St. Gregory had a viſion during the night-time, in which an old man appeared to him ſent from God, accompanied by a woman ſhining with glory; the firſt of theſe was St. John the Evangeliſt, and the other the holy virgin. St. John dictated to him a creed, which Gregory afterwards went about to preach. In his

* This aſſertion requires to be proved. It cannot be denied, that, from the time that hiſtory ſucceeded to fiction, the Egyptians have conſtantly appeared a people as daſtardly as they were ſuperſtitious. Cambyſes made the conqueſt of their country in a ſingle battle; Alexander gave them laws without ſtriking

his way he paſſed through Neoceſarea, where the rain obliged him to ſtay all night, and he took up his lodgings

ing a ſtroke, or without one of their cities daring to wait a ſiege. The Ptolemies ſubdued them with as little trouble, nor did Octavius and Auguſtus Cæſar find more difficulty in bringing them under their obedience. Omar over-run all Egypt in one ſingle campaign; the Mammelukes, who inhabited Colchos, and the regions of Mount Caucaſus, became their maſters afterwards; and it was theſe people, and not the Egyptians, who defeated the army of St. Lewis, and took that king priſoner. At length the Mammelukes having, in proceſs of time, become Egyptians, that is to ſay, effeminate, cowardly, lazy, and diſſipated, like the original natives of the climate, they were in three months time brought under the yoke of Selim I. who cauſed their ſoldan to be hanged, and made their kingdom a province of the Turkiſh empire, and ſuch it will remain, till other barbarians may hereafter make themſelves maſters of it.

Herodotus relates, that, in the fabulous ages, a king of Egypt called Seſoſtris, left his country in order to go and make the conqueſt of the world: it is evident, that ſuch a deſign could only be worthy of a Don Quixote; and not to mention that the name Seſoſtris is not Egyptian, we may rank this event like many others of the ſame date among the romances and fairy tales. Nothing is more common among a conquered people than to tell ſtrange ſtories of their former grandeur; juſt as, in ſome countries, certain wretched families, in want of the common neceſſaries of life, pride themſelves upon being deſcended from antient ſovereigns. The Egyptian prieſts told Herodotus, that this king, whom he called Seſoſtris, went on an expedition to conquer Colchos; which is much the ſame as if we were to ſay, that a king of France ſet out from Touraine to conquer Norway.

It avails not that theſe ſtories are found repeated in a thouſand different writers; it makes them not a whit more probable; it is much more natural to ſuppoſe, that the fierce and athletic inhabitants of mount Caucaſus, of Colchos, and the other parts of Scythia, who ſo often made incurſions upon, and ravaged Aſia, might have penetrated as far as Egypt; and although the prieſts of Colchos might afterwards have carried back with them the form of circumciſion, yet that is no kind of proof that they were ever conquered by the Egyptians. Diodorus Siculus tells us, that all the kings that were conquered by Seſoſtris, came every year from their own kingdoms to bring him their reſpective tributes, when Seſoſtris made them draw the chariot in which he went in triumph to the temples of his gods. Theſe old womens ſtories we ſee every day gravely copied by other writers; it muſt be confeſſed, that theſe kings

ings near a temple famous for its oracles. Here he made ſeveral ſigns of the croſs. The high-prieſt coming the next morning into the temple was ſurpriſed to find, that the oracle did not give its anſwer as uſual; upon which he invoked the ſpirits of the place, who appearing, told him, that they could no longer inhabit that manſion, as St. Gregory had paſſed a night there, and had made ſigns of the croſs; upon which the high-prieſt cauſed Gregory to be ſeized, who gave him to underſtand,

were very complaiſant, to come every year ſo far to be made hackney horſes of.

As to their pyramids, and other monuments of antiquity, they prove nothing but the pride and bad taſte of the Egyptian princes, and the wretched ſlavery of a weak people, who employed their ſtrength, which was their only ſupport, in pleaſing the barbarous oſtentation of their maſters. The polity of theſe people, even in thoſe times which are ſo much cried up, appears to have been both abſurd and tyrannical: they pretended, that the whole univerſe belonged to their monarchy. It well became ſuch an abject race to ſet up for conquerors of the world!

The profound learning which we find attributed to the Egyptian prieſts is alſo one of the moſt ridiculous abſurdities in ancient hiſtory, that is to ſay, in fable. People who pretended that in a revolution of eleven thouſand years, the ſun had roſe twice in the weſt and ſet twice in the eaſt in beginning his courſe anew, were doubtleſs curious aſtronomers. The religion of theſe prieſts, who governed the ſtate, was inferior even to that of the moſt ſavage people of America: every one knows that crocodiles, monkies, cats, and onions, were the objects of their adoration, and there is not perhaps in the world ſo abſurd a worſhip, excepting that of the great Lama.

Their arts were as mean as their religion; there is not one ancient Egyptian ſtatue fit to be ſeen; and whatever they had amongſt them of any merit, came from Alexandria in the times of the Ptolomies and Cæſars, and were the works of Grecian artiſts: nay, they were even obliged to ſend to Greece for maſters to teach them geometry.

The illuſtrious Boſſuet, in his diſcourſe upon univerſal hiſtory, dedicated to the ſon of Lewis the Fourteenth, runs wild in his encomiums upon the merits of the Egyptians; this may dazzle the underſtanding of a young prince, but will never ſatisfy men of learning. This production is a very fine piece of eloquence; but an hiſtorian ought to be more of the philoſopher that the orator. The reflections here offered concerning the Egyptians are merely conjectural; for by what other name can we call any thing that is ſaid concerning antiquity?

underſtand, that he could drive out or cauſe to enter the familiar ſpirits wherever he pleaſed: if ſo, ſaid the high-prieſt, pray ſend them back here again; then St. Gregory tearing a leaf from a little book he held in his hand, wrote theſe words upon it, "Gregory to Satan, "I command thee to enter again into this temple;" the paper being laid upon the altar, the dæmons, in obedience to the ſaint's mandate, gave their oracles that day as uſual; after which they remained ſilent.

This ſtory is related by St. Gregory of Nyſſa in his life of St. Gregory Taumaturgos. Certainly the idolatrous prieſts had great reaſon to be offended with St. Gregory, and might have delivered him over to the ſecular power, as one who was their greateſt enemy; and yet we do not find that they offered him any hurt.

The hiſtory of St. Cyprian informs us, that he was the firſt biſhop of Carthage who ſuffered martyrdom; this was Anno Dom. 258. conſequently no biſhop of Carthage had been put to death on account of religion for a great length of time. The hiſtory of this ſaint does not inform us what charge was brought againſt him, who were his enemies, or how he incurred the diſpleaſure of the proconſul of Africa. We find St. Cyprian thus writing to Cornelius, biſhop of Rome, "There has been a tumult of the people lately at "Carthage, in which it was twice propoſed to throw "me to the lions." It might poſſibly happen, that the blind reſentment of the people of Carthage did at length cauſe Cyprian to be put to death; for certainly, he was never condemned to ſuffer for his religion by the emperor Gallus, who lived at ſo great a diſtance, and, moreover, permitted Cornelius to exerciſe his epiſcopal function under his very eye.

So many and various are the hidden cauſes that are frequently blended with the apparent one, in the perſecution of an individual, that it is hardly poſſible for poſterity to diſcover the true ſource of the misfortunes that befal even the moſt conſiderable perſonages, much leſs that of the ſufferings of a private perſon, hardly known to any but thoſe of his own ſect.

And here let it be obſerved, that St Gregory Taumauturgos, and St. Denis, biſhop of Alexandria, who were both cotemporaries with St. Cyprian, neither of them ſuffered any perſecution. How then happened it, that being certainly as well known as the biſhop of Carthage, they were ſuffered to live unmoleſted, while he was delivered over to puniſhment? May we not fairly infer, that the one fell a victim to perſonal and powerful enemies, either in conſequence of a malicious accuſation, or from reaſons of ſtate, which frequently interfere in religious matters, while the other had the good fortune to eſcape the deſigns of wicked men?

We cannot with any degree of probability ſuppoſe, that the charge of being a Chriſtian was the only cauſe of St. Ignatius being put to death, under the juſt and merciful Trajan, ſince we find that ſeveral of his own religion were ſuffered to accompany and miniſter comfort to him on his way to Rome *. There had been frequent

* Tho' we do not preſume to doubt the ſuffering of St. Ignatius; yet, can any man of common underſtanding, who reads the account of his martyrdom, pervent ſome doubts from riſing in his mind? The unknown author of this narrative ſays, that "Trajan thought his glory would not be complete, unleſs he "ſubjected the God of the Chriſtians to his obedience." What a thought! Was Trajan that kind of man who would deſire to triumph over the Gods? The emperor is ſaid to have thus accoſted Ignatius when he was brought before him, "Who art "thou, unclean ſpirit?" It is very unlikely that an emperor would have diſcourſed with a priſoner, or have paſſed ſentence upon him himſelf; it is not cuſtomary for ſovereign princes to do ſo. Trajan might poſſibly cauſe Ignatius to be brought before him, but he would not ſay to him, "Who art thou?" ſince he knew very well who he was. And as to the term *unclean ſpirit*, could it poſſibly have been uſed by ſuch a man as Trajan? Is it not evident, that this is an expreſſion uſed in exorciſing, and put by a Chriſtian into the emperor's mouth? Good heavens! what a ſtile for Trajan.

Can we imagine that Ignatius anſwered him, that he was called Theophorus, becauſe he carried Jeſus in his heart, and that Trajan entered into a long converſation with him concerning Chriſt? They make Trajan ſay at the end of this conference, "We command that Ignatius, who glories in carrying "within

frequent ſeditions in Antioch, a city remarkable for the turbulent diſpoſition of its inhabitants; here Ignatius privately acted as biſhop over the Chriſtians: it might happen that ſome of theſe diſturbances, being maliciouſly imputed to the innocent Chriſtians, had occaſioned the government to take cognizance of them; and that the judge might have been miſtaken, as it often happens.

St. Simeon, for example, was accuſed before king Sapor of being a ſpy to the Romans. The hiſtory of his martyrdom tells us, that Sapor propoſed to him to worſhip the ſun; whereas every one knows, that the Perſians paid no divine honours to that planet, but only conſidered it as an emblem of the good principle, the

" within him the crucified man, be thrown into priſon, loaded " with chains, &c." A ſophiſt, a foe to Chriſtianity, might call Jeſus Chriſt *the crucified man*; but it is hardly probable, that ſuch a term would have been uſed in a decree. The puniſhment of the croſs was ſo common among the Romans, that they could not in their law-ſtile think of diſtinguiſhing by the words crucified man the object of the Chriſtians worſhip; nor is it in this manner that the laws or the emperors pronounced ſentence.

They afterwards make Ignatius write a long letter to the Chriſtians of Rome; " I write to you," ſays he, " though " loaded with chains," Certainly, if he was allowed to write to the Chriſtians of Rome, thoſe Chriſtians were not conſidered as the objects of perſecution; conſequently, Trajan could have no deſign to ſubject their God to his obedience: or, on the other hand, if theſe Chriſtians were actually liable to perſecution, Ignatius was guilty of very great imprudence in regard to them; ſince this was betraying them to their enemies, and making himſelf an informer againſt them.

Surely thoſe who had the compiling of theſe facts, ought to have had greater regard to probability and the circumſtances of the times. The martyrdom of St. Polycarpus alſo occaſions ſome doubts. It is ſaid that a voice called to him from heaven, ſaying, " Courage, Polycarpus!" that this voice was diſtinctly heard by the Chriſtians, but by no other of the attendants: we are told alſo, that when Polycarpus was tied to the ſtake, and the fire lighted round him, that the flames parted aſunder, and a dove flew out from the midſt of them; and that this ſaint, to whom the fire ſhowed ſo much reſpect, exhaled an aromatic odour that perfumed the whole aſſembly: nevertheleſs, he, whom the fire dare not to approach, could not reſiſt the edge of the ſword. Surely we may hope for pardon, if we diſcover more piety than truth in theſe relations.

Oraſmades, or Sovereign Creator, whom they all adored.

Any one, of the leaſt tolerating ſpirit, cannot help his indignation from riſing againſt thoſe writers, who accuſed Diocleſian of perſecuting the Chriſtians after his acceſſion to the empire. Here we need only refer to Euſebius of Ceſarea, whoſe teſtimony certainly cannot be rejected. The favourite, the panegyriſt of Conſtantine, and the declared enemy of the emperors his predeceſſors, is certainly entitled to our credit, when he juſtifies thoſe very emperors. The following are his own words *:

"The emperors had for a long time given the Chriſ-
"tians great marks of their favour and benevolence;
"they had intruſted them with the care of whole pro-
"vinces; many of them lived within the imperial pa-
"lace; and ſome of the emperors even married Chriſ-
"tian women: Diocleſian in particular, eſpouſed Priſ-
"ſa, whoſe daughter was wife to Maximianus Gal-
"lerius, &c."

Let this authentic teſtimony make us cautious how we give too readily into calumny; and from hence let any impartial perſon judge, if the perſecution raiſed by Gallerius, after nineteen years of continual clemency and favour to the Chriſtians, muſt not have been occaſioned by ſome intrigues with which we are at preſent unacquainted.

From hence alſo, we may perceive the abſurdity of that fabulous ſtory of the Theban legion, ſaid to have been all maſſacred for their religion. Can any thing be more ridiculous than to make this legion be brought from Aſia by the great St. Bernard? It is altogether impoſſible that this legion ſhould have been ſent for from Aſia to quiet a tumult in Gaul, a year after that tumult was ſuppreſſed, and not leſs ſo, that ſix thouſand foot and ſeven hundred horſe-men ſhould have ſuffered themſelves to have been all murdered in a place where two hundred men only might have kept off a whole army. The account of this pretended butchery is

* Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. lib. viii.

is introduced with all the marks of impoſture: "When "the earth groaned under the tyranny of Diocleſian, "heaven was peopled with martyrs." Now, this event, ſuch as it is related, is ſuppoſed to have happened in 286, the very time in which Diocleſian moſt favoured the Chriſtians, and that the Roman empire was in a ſtate of the greateſt tranqnillity. But to cut ſhort this matter at once, no ſuch legion as the Theban ever exiſted: the Romans were both too haughty and too wiſe to form a corps of thoſe Egyptians, who ſerved only as ſlaves in Rome, *Verna Canopi:* we may as well ſuppoſe them to have had a Jewiſh legion. We have the names of two and thirty legions that formed the principal military force of the Roman empire: and it is very certain, the Theban legion is not to be found among them. In a word, we may rank this ſtory with the acroſtic verſes of the Sybils, which are ſaid to have foretold the miracles wrought by Jeſus Chriſt, and with many other like ſpurious productions, which falſe zeal has trumped up to impoſe upon credulity.

CHAP. X.

Of the DANGER of FALSE LEGENDS and PERSECUTION.

MANKIND have been too long impoſed upon by falſhood: it is therefore time that we ſhould come to the knowledge of the few truths that can be diſtinguiſhed from amidſt the clouds of fiction which cover the Roman Hiſtory from the times of Tacitus and Suetonius, and with which the annals of the other nations of antiquity have almoſt always been obſcured.

Can any one, for example, believe that the Romans, a grave and modeſt people, could have condemned Chriſtian virgins, the children of perſons of the firſt quality, to common proſtitution? This is aſſuredly very inconſiſtent with the noble auſterity of that nation, from whom we receive our laws, and who puniſhed ſo rigorouſly the leaſt tranſgreſſion of chaſtity in their

veſtals. Theſe ſhameful ſtories may indeed be found in the *Actes ſinceres* of Ruinert. But ſhould we believe th'ſe acts before the acts of the Apoſtles? The *Actes Sinceres* tell us from Bollandus, that there were in the city of Ancira ſeven Chriſtian virgins, each of them upwards of ſeventy, whom the governor Theodectes ordered to be deflowered by the young men of the place; but theſe poor maidens having eſcaped this diſaſter (as indeed there was great reaſon they ſhould), he compelled them to aſſiſt ſtark naked at the myſteries of Diana, at which, by the way, no one ever aſſiſted but in a veil. St. Theodorus, who, though indeed nothing more than an inn-keeper, was not the leſs pious for that, beſought God devoutly that he would be pleaſed to take away the lives of theſe holy maidens, leſt they ſhould yield to temptation. God heard his prayer. The governor ordered them all to be thrown into a lake with a ſtone about their necks; immediately after which they appeared to Theodotus, and begged of him, "that he would "not ſuffer their bodies to be devoured by the fiſhes." Theſe, it ſeems, were their own words.

Hereupon the inn-keeper ſaint, and ſome of his companions, went in the night-time to the ſide of the lake, which was guarded by a party of ſoldiers, a heavenly torch going all the way before to light them. When they came to the place where the guards were poſted, they ſaw a heavenly horſeman armed cap-a-pee, with a launce in his hand, who fell upon the ſoldiers and diſperſed them, while St. Theodotus drew the dead bodies of the virgins out of the water. He was afterwards carried before the governor, who ordered his head to be ſtruck off, without the heavenly horſeman interfering to prevent it. However diſpoſed we may be to pay all due reverence to the true martyrs of our holy religion, we muſt confeſs it is very hard to believe the ſtory of Bullandus and Ruinart.

Need I add to this the legend of young St. Romanus? Euſebius tells us, that having been condemned to be burnt, he was accordingly thrown into the fire, when ſome Jews, who were preſent, made a mock of Jeſus Chriſt, who ſuffered his followers to be burnt when God

God had delivered Shadrach, Meſchec, and Abednego out of the fiery furnace. No ſooner had the Jews uttered this blaſphemy, than they beheld St. Romanus walking triumphant and unhurt from forth the flaming pile: this being reported to the emperor, he gave orders for his being pardoned, telling the judge that he would not have an affair upon his hands with God, (a ſtrange expreſſion for Dioclesian!) The judge, however, notwithſtanding the emperor's clemency, ordered St. Romanus to have his tongue cut out; and, though he had executioners at hand, commanded the operation to be performed by a ſurgeon. Young Romanus, who had from his birth laboured under an impediment of ſpeech, no ſooner loſt his tongue than he ſpoke diſtinctly and with great volubility. Upon this, the ſurgeon received a ſevere reprimand; when, in order to ſhow that he had performed his operation, *ſecundum artem*, he laid hold of a man who was going by, from whom he cut juſt the ſame portion of tongue, as he had done from St. Romanus, of which the patient inſtantly died, for, adds our author very learnedly, "Anatomy teaches "us, that a man cannot live without his tongue." If Euſebius did really write ſuch ſtuff, and it has not been added by ſome other hand, what degree of credit can we give to his hiſtory?

We have the relation of the martyrdom of St. Felicity and her ſeven children, who are ſaid to have been condemned to death by the wiſe and pious Antoninus, but without giving us the author's name; who, moſt probably, poſſeſſed of more zeal than veracity, had a mind to imitate the hiſtory of the Maccabees. He begins his relation in the following manner; "St. Felicity was "by birth a Roman, and lived in the reign of Anto-"ninus:" it is clear by theſe words, that the author did not live at the ſame time with St. Felicity. He ſays, that they were judged before the pretor in the Campus Martius: whereas the Roman prefect's tribunal was not in the Campus Martius, but in the capitol; for, although the Comitii had been held there formerly, yet at this time it was uſed only as a place for reviewing

the ſoldiers, for chariot-races, and for military games: this alone is ſufficient to detect the fiction.

The author adds furthermore, that after ſentence was paſſed, the emperor committed the care of ſeeing it executed to different judges; a circumſtance which is entirely repuguant to the uſual forms in thoſe times, and in every other.

We alſo read of St. Hypolitus, who is ſaid to have been drawn in pieces by horſes, as was Hypolitus the ſon of Theſeus. But a puniſhment of this kind was not known among the ancient Romans; and this fabulous ſtory took its riſe wholly from the ſimilitude of names.

And here we may make one obſervation, that in the multitude of martyrologies, compoſed wholly by the Chriſtians themſelves, we almoſt always read of a great number of them coming of their own accord into the priſon of their condemned brother, following him to execution, ſaving the blood as it flows from him, doing the ſepulchral rites to his dead body, and performing miracles with his relics. Now, if the perſecution was levelled only at the religion, would not the authors of it have deſtroyed thoſe who thus openly declared themſelves Chriſtians, adminiſtered comfort and aſſiſtance to their brethren under ſentence, and were, moreover, charged with working enchantments with their inanimate remains? would they not have treated them as we have treated ſeveral different ſects of proteſtants, whom we have butchered and burnt by hundreds, without diſtinction of age or ſex? Is there amongſt all the authenticated accounts of the antient perſecutions a ſingle inſtance like that of St. Bartholomew, and the maſſacre in Ireland? Is there one that comes near to the annual feſtival, which is ſtill celebrated at Toulouſe, and which for its cruelty, deſerves to be for ever aboliſhed, where a whole city goes in proceſſion to return thanks to God, and felicitate each other, for having, two hundred years ago, maſſacred upwards of four thouſand of their fellow ſubjects?

With horror I ſay it, but it is an undoubted truth, that we, who call ourſelves Chriſtians, have been perſecutors

ſecutors, executioners, and aſſaſſins! And of whom? Of our own brethren: it is we who have razed an hundred towns to their foundations with the crucifix or bible in our hands, and who have continually perſevered in ſhedding torrents of blood, and lighting the fires of perſecution, from the reign of Conſtantine to the time of the religious horrors of the canibals who inhabited the Cevennes; horrors which, praiſed be God, no longer exiſt.

Indeed we ſtill ſee at times ſome miſerable wretches of the more diſtant provinces ſent to the gallows on account of religion: ſince the year 1745, eight perſons have been hanged of thoſe called predicants or miniſters of the goſpel, whoſe only crime was that of having prayed to God for their king in bad French; and giving a drop of wine, and a morſel of leavened bread, to a few ignorant peaſants. Nothing of all this is known at Paris, where pleaſure engroſſes the whole attention, and where they are ignorant of every thing that paſſes, not only in foreign kingdoms, but even in the more diſtant parts of their own. The trials in theſe caſes frequently take up leſs time than is uſed to condemn a deſerter. The king wants only to be informed of this, and he would certainly extend his mercy on ſuch occaſions.

We do not find that the Roman Catholic prieſts are treated in this manner in any proteſtant country: there are above a hundred of them, both in England and Ireland, publicly known to be ſuch, and who have yet been ſuffered to live peaceable and unmoleſted, even during the laſt war.

Shall we then always be the laſt to adopt the wholeſome ſentiments of other nations? They have corrected their errors, when ſhall we correct ours? It has required ſixty years to make us receive the demonſtrations of the great Newton: we have but juſt begun to dare to ſave the lives of our children by inoculation, and it is but of a very late date that we have put in practice the true principles of Agriculture: when ſhall we begin to put in practice the true principles of humanity, or with what face can we reproach the heathens with having made

made ſo many martyrs, when we ourſelves are guilty of the ſame cruelties in the like circumſtances?

Let it be allowed, that the Romans put to death a number of Chriſtians on account of their religion only: if ſo, the Romans were highly blameable; but ſhall we commit the ſame injuſtice, and while we reproach them for their perſecutions, be perſecutors ourſelves?

If there ſhould be any one ſo deſtitute of honeſty, or ſo blinded with enthuſiaſm, as to aſk me here, Why I thus undertake to lay open our errors and faults, and to deſtroy the credit of all our falſe miracles and fictitious legends, which ſerve to keep alive the zeal and piety of many perſons? ſhould ſuch a perſon tell me, that ſome errors are abſolutely neceſſary, that, like ulcers, they give a vent to the humours of the body, and by being taken away would endanger its deſtruction, thus would I anſwer him:

All thoſe falſe miracles by which you ſhake the credit due to real ones, the numberleſs abſurd legends with which you clog the truths of the goſpel, ſerve only to extinguiſh the pure flame of religion in our hearts. There are too many perſons, who, deſirous of being inſtructed, but who have not the time for acquiring inſtruction, ſay, the teachers of my religion have deceived me, therefore there is no religion: it is better to throw myſelf into the arms of nature than thoſe of error; and I had rather place my dependence on her law than in the inventions of men. Others again unhappily go ſtill greater lengths: they perceive that impoſture hath put a bridle in their mouths, and therefore will not ſubmit even to the neceſſary curb of truth: they incline towards atheiſm and run into depravity, becauſe others have been impoſtors and perſecutors.

Such are undeniably the conſequences of pious frauds and ſuperſtitious fopperies. Mankind in general reaſon but by halves: it is certainly a very vicious way of arguing, to ſay, that becauſe the golden legend of Voraginus, and the Flower of Saints of the jeſuit Ribadeneira, abound in nothing but abſurdities, therefore there is no God: that the Catholics have maſſacred a great number of Hugonots, and the Hugonots in their

turn

turn have murdered a great number of Catholics, therefore there is no God: that certain bad men have made uſe of confeſſion, the holy communion, and all the other ſacraments, as a means for perpetrating the moſt atrocious crimes, and therefore there is no God. For my part, I, on the contrary, ſhould conclude from hence, that there is a God, who after this tranſitory life, in which we have wandered ſo far from the true knowledge of him, and have ſeen ſo many crimes committed under the ſanction of his holy name, will at length deign to comfort us for the many dreadful calamities we have ſuffered in this life: for if we conſider the many religious wars, and the forty papal ſchiſms, which have almoſt all of them been bloody; if we reflect upon the multitude of impoſtures, which have almoſt all proved fatal; the irreconcileable animoſities excited by differences in opinions, and the numberleſs evils occaſioned by falſe zeal; I cannot but believe that men have for a long time had their hell in this world.

CHAP. XI.

The ill Conſequences of NON-TOLERATION.

WHAT then it may be demanded, ſhall every one be allowed to believe only his own reaſon, and to think that that reaſon, whether true or falſe, ſhould be the guide of his actions? Yes, certainly, provided he does not diſturb the peace of community; for man has it not in his power to believe or diſbelieve *; but he has it in his power to pay a proper reſpect to the eſtabliſhed cuſtoms of his country; and if we ſay that it is a crime not to believe in the eſtabliſhed religion, we ourſelves condemn the primitive chriſtians our forefathers, and juſtify thoſe whom we accuſe of having put them to death.

It may be replied, that the difference here is very great, becauſe all other religions are of men, whereas the

* See Mr. Locke's excellent letter upon toleration.

the Catholic, Apoſtolic and Roman church is of God alone. But let me ſeriouſly aſk, Whether the divine origin of our religion is a reaſon for eſtabliſhing it by hatred, rage, baniſhment, confiſcation of goods, impriſonment, tortures, and murder, and by ſolemn acts of thankſgiving to the Deity for ſuch outrages? The more aſſured we are of the divine authority of the Chriſtian religion, the leſs does it become weak man to enforce the obſervance of it: if it is truly of God, God will ſupport it without his aſſiſtance. Perſecution never makes any but hypocrites or rebels; a ſhocking alternative! Beſides, ought we to endeavour to eſtabliſh, by the bloody hand of the executioner, the religion of that God who fell by ſuch hands, and who, while on earth, taught only mercy and forbearance?

And here let us conſider a while the dreadful conſequences of the right of non-toleration; if it was permitted us to ſtrip of his poſſeſſions, to throw into priſon or to take away the life of a fellow-creature, who, born under a certain degree of latitude, did not profeſs the generally received religion of that latitude, what is there would exempt the principal perſons of the ſtate from falling under the like puniſhments? Religion equally binds the monarch and the beggar. Accordingly, we know that upwards of fifty doctors or monks have maintained this execrable doctrine, That it was lawful to depoſe, or even to kill, ſuch princes who did not agree with the eſtabliſhed church; and we alſo know, that the ſeveral parliaments of the kingdom, have on every occaſion condemned theſe abominable deciſions of ſtill more abominable divines *.

The

* The jeſuit Buſembaum, and his commentator the Jeſuit La Croix, tells us, that it "is lawful to kill any prince excommunicated by the pope, of whatſoever country, becauſe the "whole world belongs to the pope; and that whoever accepts "of, or executes ſuch commiſſion does a meritorious and charitable act." It is this maxim which ſeems to have been invented in the mad-houſes of hell, that has almoſt ſtirred up all France againſt the Jeſuits, who are now more than ever reproached for this doctrine, which they have ſo often preached up, and as often diſavowed. They have endeavoured to juſtify themſelves

The blood of Henry the Great was ſtill reeking on the ſword of his murderer, when the parliament of Paris iſſued an arret to eſtabliſh the independance of the crown as a fundamental law: whilſt cardinal du Perron, who owed his elevation to that prince, oppoſed this decree in an aſſembly of the ſtates, and got it ſuppreſſed. The following expreſſion, made uſe of on this occaſion by Du Perron, is to be found in all the hiſtorical tracts of thoſe times: "Should a prince, ſays he, turn Arian "it would be neceſſary to depoſe him."

But

themſelves by producing nearly the ſame maxims in the writings of St. Thomas D'Aquinas and ſeveral Dominicans ‡. It is true indeed, that this St. Thomas, the angelic Doctor and Interpreter of the Divine Will, advances, that an apoſtate prince loſes his right to the crown, and forfeits the obedience due to him from his ſubject †: that the church may condemn him to death: that the emperor Julian was permitted to reign only, becauſe he was too powerful to be reſiſted: that we ought to kill every heretic §: that thoſe who deliver a people from the government of a tyrannical prince, &c. &c. We have, doubtleſs, a great reſpect for the angel of the ſchools; but if he had preached up ſuch maxims in France at the time of his brother James Clement, and the mendicant Ravaillac, his angelical doctorſhip would have met with but a ſcurvy reception.

It muſt be confeſſed, that John Gerſon, chancellor of the univerſity, carried the matter yet farther than St. Thomas; and John Pettit, the Franciſcan, ſtill farther than Gerſon. Several of the order openly maintained the deteſtable maxims of their brother Pettit. It muſt be acknowledged, that this helliſh doctrine of king-killing proceeds wholly from the ridiculous notion which has ſo long prevailed amongſt all orders of monks, that the pope is a God upon earth, and can diſpoſe of the crowns and lives of ſovereigns at his pleaſure. In this reſpect, we are inferior even to thoſe Tartarian idolaters, who hold the grand Lama to be immortal; greedily gather the contents of his cloſe-ſtool, dry theſe precious relics with great care, incloſe them in rich caſes, and kiſs them with the warmeſt devotion. For my part, I confeſs, that I had rather, for the good of my country, and the ſake of public tranquillity, carry thoſe relics conſtantly about my neck, than to give my aſſent to the pope's having in any caſe whatſoever, an authority over the temporals of kings or even thoſe of a private perſon.

‡ Peruſe, if you can get it, the letter of a layman to a divine on the ſubject of St. Thomas, a jeſuitical pamphlet publiſhed in 1762.

† Lib. ii. part ii. queſtion 12. § Ibid. Queſt. 11. and 12.

But here I muſt beg the cardinal's pardon; for let us for a while adopt his chimerical ſuppoſition, and ſay, that one of our kings having read the Hiſtory of the Councils and of the Fathers, and being ſtruck with theſe words, "My Father is greater than me," and taking them in too literal a ſenſe, ſhould be divided between the council of Nice and that of Conſtantinople, and adopt the opinion of Euſebius of Nicomedia: yet I ſhould not be the leſs obliged to obey my king, nor think the oath of allegiance I had taken to him leſs binding; and if you, Mr. Cardinal, ſhould dare to oppoſe him, and I was one of your judges, I ſhould, without ſcruple, declare you guilty of high treaſon.

Du Perron carried this diſpute much farther; but I ſhall cut it very ſhort, by ſaying with every good citizen, that I ſhould not look upon myſelf bound to obey Henry IV. becauſe he was king; but becauſe he held the crown by the inconteſtable right of birth, and as the juſt reward of his virtue and magnanimity.

Permit me then to ſay, that every individual is entitled by the ſame right to enjoy the inheritance of his father, and that he in no wiſe deſerves to be deprived of it, or to be ſent to the gallows, becauſe he may perhaps be of the opinion of Ratram againſt Paſchaſius Ratberg, or of Barengarius againſt Scotus.

We are very ſenſible that there are many of our tenets which have not been always clearly explained: Jeſus Chriſt not having expreſsly told us in what manner the Holy Ghoſt really proceeds, both the Latin church and the Greek believed, that it proceeded only from the father; but afterwards an article was added to the creed, in which it is ſaid to proceed from the ſon alſo. Now, I deſire to know, whether the day after this new article was added, a perſon who might abide by the old creed, would have been deſerving of death? And is there leſs cruelty or injuſtice, in puniſhing at this day, a perſon who may poſſibly think as they did two or three centuries ago? Or was there any crime in believing in the time of Honorius I. that Chriſt had not two wills?

It is but very lately, that the belief of the immaculate conception has been eſtabliſhed: the Dominicans have not received it as yet. Now will any one tell me the preciſe point of time, when the Dominicans will begin to deſerve puniſhment in this world, and in that which is to come.

If any one can ſet us an example for our conduct, it is certainly the Apoſtles and the Evangeliſts. There was ſufficient matter to excite a violent ſchiſm between St. Peter and St. Paul. The latter in his Epiſtles to the Galatians *, ſays, "That he withſtood Peter to the "face, becauſe he was to be blamed; for before that "certain men came from James, he did eat with the "Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew "and ſeparated himſelf, fearing them which were of "the circumciſion, inſomuch, that Barnabas alſo was "carried away with his diſſimulation." "But," adds he, "When I ſaw that they walked not uprightly, ac"cording to the truth of the Goſpel, I ſaid unto Peter "before them all, if thou, being a Jew, liveſt after "the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, "why compelleſt thou the Gentiles to live as do the "Jews?"

Here now was a ſubject for a violent diſpute. The queſtion was, whether the new Chriſtians followed the manner of the Jews or not. St. Paul at that very time ſacrificed in the temple of Jeruſalem; and we know that the fifteen firſt biſhops of Jeruſalem were circumciſed Jews; and that they obſerved the Sabbath, and abſtained from the meats forbidden by the Jewiſh law. Should a biſhop of Spain or Portugal at this time be circumciſed, or obſerve the Sabbath, he would infallibly burn at an *auto-da-fé*: and yet this fundamental point did not occaſion the leaſt animoſity between the Apoſtles, or between the primitive Chriſtians.

If the Evangeliſts had reſembled our modern writers, what an immenſe field was there for diſputation between them. St. Matthew reckons only eight and twenty generations from David to Jeſus. St. Luke reckons forty-one; and theſe generations are abſolutely different.

* Chap. ii. v. 11—14.

different. Yet no diſſention appears to have ariſen between the diſciples on account of theſe apparent contradictions, which have been ſo admirably well reconciled by the fathers of the church: but they ſtill continued in brotherly love, peace, and charity with each other. What more noble leſſon can we have of indulgence in our diſputes, and of humility in regard to thoſe things which we do not underſtand?

St. Paul, in his Epiſtle to certain Jews of Rome who had been converted to Chriſtianity, employs all the latter part of his third chapter, in telling them, that by faith alone they will be glorified, and that no man is juſtified by good works only. St. James, on the contrary, in the ſecond chapter of his Epiſtle to the twelve tribes diſperſed over the earth, is continually preaching up to them, that without good works no man can be ſaved. This has occaſioned the ſeparation of two great communions among us; but it cauſed no diviſion among the Apoſtles.

If the perſecuting of thoſe who differ from us in opinion, is an holy action, it muſt be confeſſed, that he who had murdered the greateſt number of heretics would be the moſt glorious ſaint in heaven. If ſo, what a pitiful figure would a man who had only ſtripped his brethren of all they had, and thrown them to rot in a dungeon, make, in compariſon of the zealot who had butchered his hundreds on the famous day of St. Bartholomew? This may be proved as follows:

The ſucceſſor of St. Peter and his conſiſtory cannot err; they approved, they celebrated, they conſecrated the action of St. Bartholomew; conſequently that action was holy and meritorious; and, by a like deduction, he who, of two murderers equal in piety, had ripped up the bellies of eighty Hugonot women big with child, would be entitled to double the portion of glory of another who had butchered but twelve: in this manner, by the ſame argument alſo, the enthuſiaſts of the Cevennes have reaſon to believe that they will be exalted in glory, in proportion to the number of catholic women, prieſts and monks, whom they may have knocked

knocked on the head: but ſurely theſe are ſtrange claims to eternal happineſs.

CHAP. XII.

If NON-TOLERATION was part of the divine Law among the JEWS, and whether it was always put in practice.

BY the divine law, I take to be underſtood thoſe rules and precepts which have been given to us by God himſelf. For example, he ordained, that the Jews ſhould eat a lamb dreſſed with bitter herbs, and ſtanding with a ſtaff in their hand, in remembrance of the paſſover; that the conſecration of the high-prieſt ſhould be performed by touching the tip of his right ear, his right hand, and his right foot with blood; that the ſcape-goat ſhould be charged with the ſins of the people; he alſo forbid the eating of all ſhell-fiſh, ſwine, hares, hedge-hodgs, owls, the heron, and the lapwing *.

He alſo inſtituted their ſeveral feaſts and ceremonies; and all thoſe things which appeared arbitrary to other nations, and ſubjected to poſitive law and cuſtom, when commanded by God himſelf, became a divine law to the Jews, in like manner, as whatever Jeſus Chriſt the ſon of Mary and the ſon of God has commanded us, is to us a divine law.

But here let us not preſume to inquire wherefore it hath pleaſed God to ſubſtitute a new law in the room of that he had given to Moſes, and wherefore he commanded Moſes more things than he did the patriarch Abraham, and Abraham more than Noah †. In this he

* Deut. chap. xiv.

† Agreeable to my intention of making ſome uſeful notes upon this treatiſe, I ſhall here obſerve, that although God is ſaid to have made a covenant with Noah, and with all the beaſts of the field: yet he permits him to eat of every thing that hath the breath of life, excepting only the eating of blood, which he poſitively prohibits; and moreover adds, that "the Lord will take "vengeance of every beaſt by whom man's blood ſhall be ſhed."

From

he appears with infinite condeſcenſion, to have accommodated himſelf to times and the ſtate of population amongſt

From theſe paſſages and ſeveral others of the like tenor, we may infer, with all the ſages of antient and preſent times, and with every perſon of enlightened conceptions, that beaſts are endowed with ſome knowledge. We do not find God making a covenant with trees or with ſtones that have no ſenſe; but he does with the beaſts, whom it has pleaſed him to endow with ſenſes, frequently more exquiſite than our own, and conſequently with thoſe ideas that are neceſſarily connected with ſenſe. It is for this reaſon, that he prohibits the barbarous cuſtom of feeding upon their blood, the blood being the ſource of life, and conſequently of ſenſe. Take away all the blood from an animal, and all his organs will immediately ceaſe from action. It is therefore with the greateſt juſtice that we find it ſaid in ſo many differeat parts of the Holy Scripture, that the ſoul, that is to ſay, what was called the ſenſitive ſoul, is in the blood; an opinion perfectly agreeable to nature, and as ſuch received by all nations.

It is upon this opinion that we found that pity which we ought to ſhow to all animals. It is one of the ſeven precepts of the Noachides that were adopted by the Jews, That no one ſhall eat the limb of a living animal. This precept is a proof that mankind had formerly the cruelty to mutilate animals, in order to feaſt upon the limbs ſo cut off, and to leave the creatures living, in order to feed ſucceſſively upon the other parts of their bodies; a cuſtom which we find to have actually ſubſiſted among ſome barbarous nations, witneſs the ſacrifices offered in the iſland of Chios to *Bacchus Omadios*, or the eater of fleſh. God, by permitting the fleſh of animals to ſerve us for food, ſeems to recommend them to our humanity. It muſt be confeſſed, that there is great cruelty in putting them to torture, and that nothing but cuſtom could have leſſened in us the natural abhorrence of ſlaughtering an animal whom we have fed with our own hands. There have in all times been ſects who have made a religious ſcruple of ſuch practices, as do to this day all the inhabitants of the peninſula of the Ganges. The whole ſect of Pythagoreans, both in Greece and Italy, conſtantly abſtained from the eating of fleſh. And Porphyry, in his book upon Abſtinence, reproaches his diſciples with having quitted their ſect only for the ſake of indulging an inhuman appetite.

It is in my opinion giving up the light of reaſon, to pretend to aſſert, that beaſts are no more than mere machines: for, is it not a manifeſt contradiction, to acknowledge that God has given them the organs of ſenſe, and then to affirm that they have no ſenſe?

Beſides, I think one muſt never have made any obſervation upon

mongſt the inhabitants of the earth; and in this gration, to have ſhewn his paternal love: but theſe are epths too profound for our weak faculties to meaſure; ſhall therefore confine myſelf to my ſubject, and proeed to examine the ſtate of non-toleration among the ews.

It is certain, that in Exodus, Numbers, Leviticus, nd Deuteronomy, we find ſeveral very rigorous laws nd ſevere puniſhments in relation to religious worſhip. everal able commentators have been greatly puzzled to econcile theſe books of Moſes with ſeveral paſſages in he prophets Jeremiah and Amos, and with the famous iſcourſe of St. Stephen, as related in the Acts of the poſtles. Amos ſays, that the Jews conſtantly worhipped in the wilderneſs, Moloc and Chiun, gods whom hey had made to themſelves *. And Jeremiah expreſſy ſays, that God commanded not their fathers concerng burnt-offerings or ſacrifices in the day that he rought them out of the land of Egypt †. And St. tephen in his diſcourſe to the Jews abovementioned, ys, "They worſhipped the hoſt of heaven, and that they neither offered ſacrifices nor ſlew beaſts, for the ſpace of forty years in the wilderneſs, but took up the tabernacle of Moloc and the ſtar of their god Remphan ‡."

Other

pon animals, not to diſtinguiſh in them the different cries of ant, ſuffering, joy, fear, love, anger, and indeed all other ffections of the mind or body; ſurely, it would be very ſtrange, at they ſhould ſo well expreſs what they have no ſenſe of!

This remark may furniſh abundant matter of reflection to inuiſitive minds, in relation to the power and goodneſs of the reator, who has been pleaſed to beſtow life, ſenſe, ideas, and emory, on thoſe beings, whoſe organs he has formed with his wn all-powerful hand. As to us, we neither know how theſe gans are formed, how they are unfolded, in what manner we ceive life, nor by what laws, ſenſe, ideas, memory, and will, e annexed to that life; and yet, in this dark and eternal ſtate ignorance inherent to our natures, we are perpetually diſputg with, and perſecuting each other, like the bulls of the field, ho fight with their horns, without knowing for what uſe, or in hat manner thoſe horns were given them.

* Amos, ch. v. v. 26. † Jerem. ch. vii. v. 22.
‡ Acts, ch. vii. v. 42.

Other critics again infer from the worſhip of ſo many ſtrange gods here mentioned, that the Iſraelites were indulged with having theſe gods by Moſes; and, in ſupport of their opinion they quote the following words in Deuteronomy, "When ye ſhall enter into the land "of Canaan, ye ſhall not do after all the things that "we do here this day, every man whatſoever is right "in his own eyes *†,"

And

† Deut. ch. xii. v. 8.

* Several writers have too raſhly concluded from this paſſage, that the chapter concerning the golden calf (which is no other than the Egyptian god Apis) has, as well as many other chapters, been added to the books of Moſes.

Eben-Ezra was the firſt who undertook to prove, that the Pentateuch (or the five books of Moſes) was written in the times of the Kings. Wollaſton, Collins, Tindal, Shafteſbury, Bolingbroke, and many others, have aſſerted, that in thoſe ages, men had no other way of committing their thoughts to writing, but by engraving them upon poliſhed ſtone, brick, lead, or wood; and tell us that in the time of Moſes the Chaldeans and Egyptians had no other way of writing, and that then they could engrave but in a very abridged manner, and by hieroglyphics, the ſubſtance only of ſuch things as they thought worthy of being tranſmitted to poſterity, and could never form any regular hiſtories: then it was next to an impoſſibility to engrave books of any conſiderable bulk in the wilderneſs, where they were continually changing of their habitation; where they had no perſon to furniſh them with cloathing, to make that cloathing for them, or even to mend their ſandals, and where God was obliged to perform a miracle to preſerve the garments of his people entire. They ſay, that it is hardly probable, that there ſhould have been ſo many engravers among them, at the time that they were ſo deficient in the more neceſſary arts of life, and did not know even how to make bread: and if we anſwer to this, that the pillars of the tabernacle were of braſs, and their chapiters of maſſy ſilver, they reply, that though the order for this might have been given in the wilderneſs, it was not executed till after they were ſettled in perfect tranquillity.

They cannot conceive, they ſay, how the Iſraelites, who were a poor and vagabond people, could have aſked for a calf of maſſy gold to be erected for the object of their adoration, at the foot of the very mountain where God was then talking with Moſes, and in the very midſt of the thunder and lightning, and the ſound of the heavenly trumpet, which were heard and ſeen by all preſent. They profeſs their aſtoniſhment, that it ſhould have been only the day before Moſes deſcended from the moun-

tain

And as a farther proof, they ſay that there is no mention made of any religious act of the people of Iſrael while

tain, that all the people ſhould have addreſſed themſelves to his brother Aaron, to raiſe this golden calf? or how it was poſſible for Aaron to have caſt ſuch an image in one ſingle day; and ſtill more, how Moſes could have reduced it into an impalpable powder? They ſay, that it is impoſſible for any artiſt to make a ſtatue of gold in leſs than three months, and that not all the poſſible efforts of the chymical art, are ſufficient to reduce ſuch a maſs into a powder that may be ſwallowed, and conſequently, that the prevarication of Aaron and this operation of Moſes muſt have been too miracles.

Deceived by the humanity and goodneſs of their hearts, they cannot believe that Moſes ſlaughtered three and twenty th uſand ſouls to expiate this crime; nor, that ſo many men would have tamely ſuffered themſelves to be murdered without a third miracle. Laſtly, they think it very extraordinary, that Aaron, who was the moſt guilty of all, ſhould have been rewarded for that very crime for which the reſt underwent ſo dreadful a puniſhment, by being created high-prieſt, and go to offer ſacrifice at the high altar, while the bodies of three and twenty thouſand of his ſlaughtered brethren lay bleeding round him.

They ſtart the ſame difficulties concerning the eighty thouſand Iſraelites who were ſlain by order of Moſes, to atone for the crime of a ſingle one of them, for being ſurprized with a Moabite woman; and ſeeing that Solomon, and ſo many other of the Jewiſh kings, did, without being puniſhed for it, take to themſelves ſtrange wives, they cannot conceive what great crime there could be, in an individual making an alliance with one Moabite woman.

Ruth was a Moabiteſs, though her family was originally of Bethl hem: the ſcripture always diſtinguiſhes her by the name of Ruth the Moabiteſs; and yet, ſhe went and laid herſelf by the ſide of Boaz, received ſix meaſures of barley from him, was afterwards married to him, and was the grandmother of David. Rahab was not only a ſtranger, but alſo a common proſtitute or a harlot, as ſhe is called in Scripture; yet ſhe was taken to wife by Solomon, a prince of Juda; from whom alſo David was deſcended. This Rahab is taken to be a type of the Chriſtian church by ſeveral of the ancient fathers; and eſpecially by Origen, in his ſeventh homily upon Joſhua.

Bathſheba, the wife of Uriah, by whom David begat Solomon, was an Hittite. And if we go farther back, we ſhall find that the patriarch Judah married a Canaaniteſs; and his ſons lay with Thamar who was of the race of Aaron: and the woman with whom Judah, without knowing it, committed inceſt, was not of the Iſraeliti ſh race.

Thus

while in the wilderneſs; neither the celebration of the paſſover, nor of the feaſt of the tabernacle, nor of any public-

Thus then was our Lord Jeſus Chriſt pleaſed to take upon him fleſh in a family deſcended from five aliens, to ſhew, that all nations ſhould partake of his inheritance. The rabbin Aben-Ezra was, as we have already obſerved, the firſt who undertook to prove that the Pentateuch was compiled long after the time of Moſes; and for his authority quotes ſeveral paſſages in thoſe books; and amongſt others the following: "The Canaanite "then dwelt in that land. The mountain of Moria, called the "mountain of God. The bed of Og, king of Baſhan, is ſtill "to be ſeen in Rahab. And the country of Baſhan is called "the villages of Jaiar unto this day. Never was there a pro-"phet ſeen in Iſrael like unto Moſes. Theſe are the kings who "reigned in Edom, before any king reigned over Iſrael." He pretends, that theſe paſſages, in which mention is made of events that happened long after the time of Moſes, could never have been written by Moſes himſelf. To this it is anſwered, that theſe paſſages were added long after by way of notes by the tranſcribers.

Newton, whoſe name ought on every other occaſion to be mentioned with reſpect, but who, as a man, may have been liable to error, in the introduction to his commentaries upon Daniel and St. John, aſcribes the five books of Moſes, Joſhua, and Judges, to holy writers of much later date; and founds his opinion on the thirty-ſixth chapter of Geneſis, the ſeventeenth, eighteenth, nineteenth and twenty-firſt chapters of Judges, the eighth chapter of Samuel, the ſecond chapter of Chronicles, and the fourth chapter of the book of Ruth: and indeed, conſidering that in the thirty-ſixth chapter of Geneſis, we find mention made of Kings, and that David is ſpoken of in the books of Judges, and that of Ruth, it ſhould ſeem that thoſe books were compiled in the times of the Kings. This is alſo the opinion of ſeveral divines, at the head of whom is the famous Le Clerc. But there are very few of thoſe who are followers of this opinion, that have had the curioſity to fathom theſe myſteries; a curioſity, which certainly makes no part of the duty of man. For when the learned and the ignorant, the prince and the peaſant, ſhall, after this ſhort life, appear together before the throne of eternal majeſty, every one of us, then, will wiſh to have been juſt and humane, generous and compaſſionate; and no one will pride himſelf in having known exactly the year in which the Pentateuch was written, or in having been able to diſtinguiſh the true text from the additional notes in uſe among the Scribes. God will not aſk us whether we were of the opinion of the Maſorites againſt the Talmud, or whether we may not have miſtaken, a *Caph* for a *Beth*, a *Yod* for a *Vau*, or a *Daleth* for a *Reſh*.

No,

public-form of worſhip being eſtabliſhed, not even the practice of circumciſion, the ſeal of the covenant made by God with Abraham.

They

No, certainly; but he will judge us according to our deeds, and not according to our knowledge in the Hebrew language. Let us therefore abide firmly by the deciſion of the church, ſo far as is agreeable to the reaſonable duty of a believer.

We will conclude this note with an important paſſage from Leviticus, a book compoſed after the time of the golden calf. The Jews are there commanded no more to offer their ſacrifices to goats with whom they have gone a-whoring. * We cannot ſay whether this ſtrange worſhip came from Egypt, the country of ſorcery and ſuperſtition; but there is reaſon to believe, that the cuſtom of our pretended magicians of keeping a Sabbath apart, for adoring a goat, and committing ſuch deteſtable uncleanlineſs with it, as is ſhocking to conception, came from the antient Jews, as it is certain, that they firſt taught a part of Europe the practice of magic. What a deteſtable people? Surely ſuch infamous and unnatural practices deſerve a puniſhment, at leaſt equal to that which beſel them for worſhipping the golden calf; and yet, we find the law-giver contents himſelf with ſimply prohibiting thoſe practices. We have quoted this ſubject, only to ſhew what the Jewiſh nation was: the ſin of beſtiality muſt certainly have been very common amongſt them, ſince they are the only people we know among whom there was a neceſſity for any law to prohibit that crime, the commiſſion of which was not even ſuſpected by any other legiſlators.

There is reaſon to believe, that on account of the fatigues and diſtreſſes which the Jews ſuffered in the deſerts of Paran, Horeb, and Kadaſh-Barnee, the female ſpecies, which is always the weakeſt, might have failed amongſt them; and it is certain, that the Jews were greatly in want of women, ſince we find them almoſt always commanded, when they conquered any town or village, to the right or left of the lake Aſphaltes, to put all the inhabitants to the ſword, excepting only the young women, who were of an age to know man.

The Arabs, who ſtill inhabit a part of theſe deſerts, ſtipulate to this day in the treaties which they make with their caravans, that they ſhall furniſh them with marriageable women; ſo that it is not improbable, but that the young men of thoſe barren countries, might have carried the depravation of human nature ſo far, as to have had carnal commerce with goats, as it related of the ſhepherds of Calabria.

It is ſtill however uncertain, whether any monſters were produced by this unnatural copulation, and whether there is any foundation for the antient ſtories of ſatyrs, fauns, centaurs, and minotaur: hiſtory ſays there is; but natural philoſophy has not yet cleared up to us this monſtrous circumſtance.

* Leviticus, chap. vii. and chap. xviii. v. 22.

They likewiſe refer to the hiſtory of Joſhua, where this great conqueror thus addreſſes the Jews: "If it "ſeem evil unto you to ſerve the Lord, chooſe you this "day whom you will ſerve; whether the gods which "your father ſerved in Meſopotamia or the gods of the "Amorites, in whoſe land ye dwell:" and the people anſwered and ſaid, "Nay, but we will ſerve the LORD "our GOD *(Adonai)*." And Joſhua ſaid unto the people, "Ye have choſen, now therefore put away the "ſtrange gods which are among you." Hence ſay they, it is evident, that the Iſraelites had other gods beſide the LORD, *(Adonai)* under Moſes.

It is altogether needleſs to take up the reader's time with an attempt to refute the opinions of thoſe critics who think that the Pentateuch was not written by Moſes. This ſubject has been ſufficiently diſcuſſed long ago; and, even admitting that ſome few parts of it were written in the times of the Judges, the Kings, or the Prophets, it would not make the whole leſs inſpired or divine. It is ſufficient, in my opinion, if the Holy Scripture proves to us, that, notwithſtanding the extraordinary puniſhments which the Jews called down upon themſelves by their idolatrous worſhip of the golden calf, they continued for a long time to enjoy perfect liberty of conſcience; and it is even probable, that Moſes, after having maſſacred the twenty three thouſand, in the firſt tranſports of his rage againſt his brother and them for having erected this idol, finding that nothing was to be gained by ſuch ſeverity in matters of religion, was glad to wink at the fondneſs which the people expreſſed for ſtrange gods.

And indeed he himſelf appears ſoon after to have tranſgreſſed the very law which he had given †: for, notwithſtanding his having forbidden all molten or graven images, we find him erecting the brazen ſerpent. And this law was again diſpenſed with by Solomon in the building of his temple; where that prince cauſed twelve brazen bulls to be placed as ſupporters to the great Laver, as alſo cherubims in the ark, which had two

† Numbers, chap. xxi. v. 9.

two heads, one of an eagle and the other of a calf; and it was probable from this latter head, badly made, and found in the temple by the Roman ſoldiers at the time of their plundering of it, that the Jews were ſo long reported to have worſhipped an aſs. Moreover, notwithſtanding the repeated prohibitions againſt the worſhip of falſe gods, Solomon, tho' giving way to the groſſeſt idolatry, lived and died in peace. Jeroboam, to whom God himſelf gave ten parts out of twelve of the kingdom, ſet up two golden calves, and yet reigned two and twenty years, having united in his perſon the two-fold dignity of monarch and of high-prieſt. The petty people of Juda erected altars and images to ſtrange gods under Rehoboam. Pious king Aza ſuffered the high places to remain undemoliſhed. And laſtly, Uriah the high-prieſt erected a brazen altar, which had been ſent to him by the king of Syria, in the temple, in the place of the altar of burnt-offerings *. In a word, we do not any where find the leaſt conſtraint in point of religion among the Jews; it is true, indeed, that they frequently deſtroyed and murdered one another; but that was from motives of political concern, and not about the modes of belief. It is true, that among the prophets we find ſome making heaven a party in their revenge. Elias, for inſtance, calls down fire from heaven to conſume the prieſts of Baal †. And Elijah ſent bears to devour two and forty little children, for calling him bald head ‡. But theſe miracles are very rare in their kind, and it would moreover be ſomewhat inhuman to deſire to imitate them. We are alſo told that the Jews were a moſt ignorant and cruel people: and that in their war with the Midianites § they were commanded by Moſes to kill all the male children and all child-bearing women, and to divide the ſpoil ‖. They

* Kings, b. iv. ch. xvi.
† Kings, b. iii. ch. xviii. ver. 38 and 40.
‡ Kings, b. iv. ch. ii. ver. 20.
§ Midian was not included in the Land of Promiſe: it is a little canton of Idumea, in Arabia Petræa, beginning to the northward

found in the enemy's camp 675,000 ſheep, 72,000 oxen, 61,000 aſſes, and 32,000 young maidens, and they took all the ſpoil and ſlew the captives. Several commentators will have it, that thirty-two of the young women were ſacrificed to the Lord; "The Lord's tri-"bute was thirty and two perſons*."

It is evident that the Jews offered human ſacrifices to God; witneſs that of Jephtha's daughter †, and king Agag hewed in pieces by the prophet Samuel ‡. And we

northward of the torrent of Arron, and ending at the torrent of Zared, in the midſt of rocks on the eaſtern border of the lake Aſphaltes. This country is inhabited by a ſmall Arabian herd or tribe, and may be about eight leagues long, and about ſeven in breadth.

§ Numb. chap. xxxi.

* Numb. ch. xxxi. ver. 40.

† It is plain by the text, that Jephtha did actually ſacrifice his daughter. Doctor Calmet, in his diſſertation upon Jephtha's vow, ſays, that "God did not approve theſe vows; but when "once any one had made them, he inſiſted upon their being "fulfilled, was it only to puniſh thoſe who made them, and to "put a check upon them in the doing it, by the fear of being "obliged to perform them." This action of Jephtha is condemned by St. Auguſtine and almoſt all the fathers, although the Scripture ſays, that he was filled with the ſpirit of God; and St. Paul, in his eleventh chapter of his Epiſtle to the Hebrews, greatly praiſes Jephtha, exalting him even above Samuel and David.

St. Jerom, in his Epiſtle to Julian, expreſſes himſelf thus: "Jephtha ſacrificed his daughter to the Lord, and therefore the "Apoſtle has placed him among the ſaints." Here now is a diverſity in opinions, concerning which it is not permitted to pronounce a deciſion; nay, it is even dangerous to have any opinion of our own.

‡ The death of Agag, king of the Amalekites, may be looked upon as a real ſacrifice. Saul had made this prince a priſoner of war, and had admitted him to a capitulation notwithſtanding that the prieſt and the prophet Samuel had charged him to ſpare no one; ſaying to him expreſsly, * "Go and ſmite "Amalek, and utterly deſtroy all that they have, and ſpare "them not, but ſlay both man and woman, infant and ſuckling, "ox and ſheep, camel and aſs." — "And Samuel hewed Agag "in pieces before the Lord at Gilgal."

* *Firſt of Samuel, chap. xv. ver. 6th and 23d.*

"The

we find the prophet Ezekiel promiſing them, by way of encouragement, that they ſhould feaſt upon human fleſh: "Ye ſhall eat of the fleſh of the horſe, and of

"The zeal with which this prophet was animated," ſaith Calmet, "put a ſword into his hand on this occaſion, to revenge "the honour of God, and to confound Saul."

In this melancholy adventure, we have a vow, a prieſt, and a victim; conſequently, it is a real ſacrifice. We find from hiſtory, that moſt nations, the Chineſe excepted, were wont to ſacrifice human victims to the Deity: Plutarch ſays, that this cuſtom prevailed even among the Romans at ſome certain times. Cæſar, in his Commentaries, tells us, that the Germans were going to ſacrifice two of his officers, whom he had ſent to confer with their king Arioviſtus, had not Cæſar delivered them by beating the German army. I have in another place obſerved *, that this violation of the laws of nations, and the offering of human victims, which was rendered more horrible by its being done by the hands of their women, ſeems a little to contradict Tacitus's panegyric on them in his treatiſe *De moribus Germanorum*; which ſeems rather to have been deſigned as a ſatire upon the Roman people, than to praiſe the Germans, to whom he was an utter ſtranger. And here we may obſerve by the way, that Tacitus was fonder of ſatire than of truth: he labours to throw every thing, even the moſt indifferent actions, into an odious point of light; and his malice pleaſes us as much as his ſtile, becauſe we are naturally fond of wit and ſlander.

But to return to the ſubject of human ſacrifices. This cuſtom prevailed as much amongſt our forefathers as with the Germans; it is the loweſt degree of debaſement to which human nature can fall when left to herſelf, and is one of the effects of the weakneſs of mortal underſtanding, which reaſons thus: We ought to offer to God whatever we have of moſt pleaſing or valuable; there is nothing more valuable than our children; therefore we ought to ſelect the youngeſt and moſt beautiful, to ſacrifice them to the Deity.

Philo ſays, that the Canaanites uſed to offer their children in ſacrifice, before God had commanded Abraham, as a trial of his faith, to offer up his only ſon Iſaac.

Sanchoniathon, as quoted by Euſebius, ſays, that the Phœnicians, when threatened with any great danger or diſtreſs, offered up the moſt favourite of their children, and that Ilus ſacrificed his ſon Jehud much about the ſame time, that God made the trial of Abraham's faith. It is very difficult to penetrate into the dark receſſes of early antiquity; but it is too melancholy a truth that theſe horrible ſacrifices were almoſt every where in uſe: and men have laid them aſide, only in proportion as they have become civilized. So true is it that civilization is the nurſe of humanity.

* *Additions to General Hiſtory, part i. of Voltaire.*

" his rider, and ye ſhall drink the blood of the princes " of the earth *." But although the hiſtory of this people does not furniſh us with one ſingle act of generoſity, magnanimity, or humanity; yet amidſt ſo long and diſmal a night of barbariſm, there is continually breaking forth a chearing ray of univerſal toleration.

Jephtha, who was inſpired of God, and who ſacrificed to him his daughter, ſays to the chief of the Amorites, " Wilt not thou poſſeſs that which Chemoſh thy " God giveth thee to poſſeſs? ſo whomſoever the Lord " our God ſhall drive from before us, them will we " poſſeſs †." This declaration is expreſs, and might be carried to a great length; however, it is at leaſt an evident proof that God permitted the worſhip of Chemoſh. For the words of the holy ſcripture are not " *Thou thinkeſt* thou haſt a right to poſſeſs that which " thy god Chemoſh giveth thee to poſſeſs;" but expreſsly, " *Thou haſt* a right to poſſeſs, &c." for that is the true interpretation of the Hebrew words *Otho thiraſch*.

The ſtory of Micah and the Levite, related in the ſeventeenth and eighteenth chapters of the book of Judges, is a ſtill more inconteſtible proof of this extenſive toleration and liberty of conſcience among the Jews. The mother of Micah having loſt eleven hundred ſhekels of ſilver, and her ſon having reſtored them to her, ſhe dedicated or vowed them unto the Lord, and made images with them, and ſhe built a ſmall chapel and hired a Levite to officiate therein for ten ſhekels of ſilver by the year, and a ſuit of apparel and his victuals. Then ſaid Micah, " Now know I that the Lord will " do me good, ſeeing that I have a Levite to be my " prieſt ‡."

In a ſhort time after, ſix hundred men of the tribe of Dan, who were in ſearch of ſome town which they might ſeize upon as an inheritance to dwell in, came to the houſe of Micah, where they found the Levite officiating;

* Ezek. chap. xxxix. ver. 39.
† Judges, chap. xi. ver. 24.
‡ Judges, chap. xvii. ver. the laſt.

ciating; and having no prieſt of their own with them, and thinking that on that account God would not proſper their undertaking, they ſeized upon the carved image, the ephod, and the teraphim belonging to Micah, and alſo the Levite, whom they took with them in ſpite of all the remonſtrances of the latter, and the outcries of Micah and his mother. After this, full of aſſurance of ſucceſs, they went and fell upon the city of Laiſh, and ſmote all the inhabitants with the edge of the ſword, and burnt the city to the ground, as was their uſual cuſtom; they then built them another city, and called its name Dan *, in remembrance of their victory; and they ſet up Micah's graven image; and what is more remarkable, Jonathan, the grandſon of Moſes, was a prieſt of the temple, wherein the God of Iſrael and the idol of Micah were both worſhipped at the ſame time.

After the death of Gideon, the Iſraelites worſhipped Baal-Perith for upwards of twenty years, and abandoned the worſhip of the true God, without any puniſhment being inflicted upon them for it, either by their chiefs, their judges, or their prieſts. This, I muſt confeſs, was a very heinous crime; but then, if even this idolatry was tolerated, how great muſt have been the differences of the true worſhip?

There are ſome perſons, who, in ſupport of non-toleration, bring us the authority of God himſelf; who, having ſuffered his ark to fall into the hands of the Philiſtines in the day of battle, puniſhed them only by afflicting them with an inward diſtemper, reſembling the hæmorrhoids or piles, by breaking in pieces the ſtatue of their god Dagon, and by ſending a number of rats to devour the fruits of their lands. But when the Philiſtines, in order to appeaſe his wrath, ſent back the ark drawn by two cows that gave milk to their calves, and made an offering to the Lord of five golden rats, and the like number of golden hæmorrhoids, the Lord ſmote ſeventy of the Elders of Iſrael, and fifty thouſand of the people, for having looked upon the ark. To

* Judges, chap. xviii. ver. 11—29.

this it may be anſwered, that the judgment of God was not, on this occaſion, directed againſt any particular belief, any difference in worſhip, or idolatry.

If God had meant to puniſh idolatry, he would have deſtroyed all the Philiſtines who had attempted to ſeize upon his ark, and who were worſhippers of the idol Dagon; whereas we find him ſmiting with death fifty thouſand and ſeventy of his own people, for having looked upon his ark, which they ought not to have looked upon. So much did the laws and manners of thoſe times and the Jewiſh diſpenſation differ from every thing that we know, and ſo inſcrutable are the ways of God to us! "The rigorous puniſhment," ſaith the learned Doctor Calmet, "inflicted on ſuch a multitude "of perſons on this occaſion will appear exceſſive on-"ly to thoſe who do not comprehend how greatly God "would have himſelf feared and reſpected among his "choſen people, and who judge of the ways and de-"ſigns of Providence only by the weak lights of their "own reaſon."

Here then God puniſhed the Iſraelites, not for any ſtrange worſhip, but for a profanation of his own; an indiſcreet curioſity, a diſobedience of his precepts, and perhaps an inward rebellious ſpirit. It is true, that ſuch puniſhments appertain alone to the God of the Hebrews, and we cannot too often repeat, that thoſe times and manners were altogether different from ours.

Again, we find ſome ages after, when the idolatrous Naaman aſked of Elijah, if he might be allowed to follow his king up to the temple of Rimmon, and bow down himſelf there with him; this very Elijah, who had before cauſed the little children to be devoured by bears only for mocking him, anſwered this idolater, "Go in peace *."

But this is not all; we find the Lord commanding Jeremiah to make him bonds and yokes, ſaying, "Put "them upon thy neck †, and ſend them to the king-"dom

* Kings, b. iv. ch. v. ver. 25.

† Thoſe who are unacquainted with the cuſtoms of antiquity, and who judge only from what they ſee about them, may poſſibly

" dom of Edom, and to the king of Moab, and to the
" king of the Ammonites, and to the king of Zidon ;"

poſſibly be aſtoniſhed at this odd command ; but they ſhould reflect, that, at thoſe times, it was the cuſtom in Egypt, and moſt part of Aſſyria, to expreſs things by hieroglyphical figures, ſigns, and types.

The prophets, who were called *Seers* by the Egyptians and Jews, not only expreſſed themſelves in allegories, but alſo repreſented by ſigns thoſe events which they foretold. Thus we find Iſaiah, the chief of the four great prophets, taking a roll and writing therein Maher-Shalal-Haſhbaz, that is, Make haſte to the ſpoil : and going unto the propheteſs, ſhe conceived and bare a ſon, whom the Lord called Maher-Shalal-Haſhbaz *. This is a type of the evils which were to be brought upon the Jews by the people of Egypt and Aſſyria.

The prophet alſo ſays, " Before that the child ſhall be o.
" an age to eat butter and honey, to refuſe the evil and chooſe
" the good, the land that they abhorred ſhall be delivered of
" both her kings ; and the Lord will hiſs to the flies of Egypt,
" and for the bees of Aſyr, and the Lord will ſhave, with a
" razor that is hired, the beard and the hair of the feet of the
" king of Aſſyria †."

This prophecy of the bees, and of the ſhaving of the beard, and of the hair of the feet, can be underſtood only by thoſe who know that it was a cuſtom to call the ſwarms of bees together by the ſound of a flagelet or pipe, or ſome other ruſtic inſtrument ; that the greateſt affront that could be done to any man, was to cut off his beard ; and that the hair on the private parts was called the hair of the feet, which was never ſhaven but in caſes of leproſy, or other unclean diſorders. All theſe figures, which would appear ſo ſtrange in our ſtile, ſignify nothing more than that the Lord will, in the courſe of a few years, deliver his people from captivity.

We find the ſame prophet walking naked and barefoot, to ſhew that the king of Aſſyria ſhall lead away the Egyptians and Ethiopians captives, without their having wherewithal to cover their nakedneſs §.

The prophet Exekiel eats the roll of parchment which God had given him : afterwards he eats his bread covered with excrement, and continues to lie on his left ſide three hundred and ninety days and forty days on his right ſide, to ſhew that the Jews ſhould want bread, and as a type of the number of years they were to remain in captivity. He loads himſelf with

* *Iſaiah, ch. viii. ver.* 1 *and* 4. † *Id. ch. vii. v.* 15—18.
§ *Iſaiah, chap. xx.*

chains

and he did ſo; bidding the meſſenger ſay to them in the name of the Lord, "I have given all your lands into

"to

chains, as a figure of thoſe which they are to wear; and he cuts off the hair of his head and of his beard, and divides them into three parts; the firſt of theſe portions is a type of thoſe who are to periſh in the city of Jeruſalem; the ſecond, of ſuch who are to be ſlain without the walls; and the third, of thoſe who are to be carried away to Babylon *.

The prophet Hoſea takes to himſelf a woman who is an adulteſs, and whom he purchaſes for fifteen pieces of ſilver, and for an omer and an half of barley, and ſays unto her, "Thou "ſhalt abide for me many days, thou ſhalt not play the harlot, "and thou ſhalt not be for another man, for ſo ſhall the chil- "dren of Iſrael abide many days without a king, and without "a prince, and without an image, and without an ephod, and "without Teraphim †." In a word, the ſeers or prophets ſcarcely ever foretel any thing without uſing a type or ſign of the thing foretold.

Jeremiah therefore only conformed to the uſual cuſtom, when he bound himſelf with cords, and put bonds and yokes upon his neck, as figures of the approaching ſlavery of thoſe to whom he ſent them, and, if we attend properly to theſe things, we ſhall find the times here ſpoken of to be like thoſe of an old world, differing in every thing from the new ſociety. The laws, the manner of making war, were all abſolutely different; and if we only open Homer and the firſt book of Herodotus, we need nothing more to convince us that there is not the leaſt reſemblance between the people of early antiquity and us; hence we ought to diſtruſt our own judgment, when we attempt to compare their manners with ours. Even nature herſelf is not now the ſame ſhe was then; magicians and ſorcerers had, at that time, a power over her which they no longer poſſeſs; they enchanted ſerpents, they raiſed the dead out of their tombs, &c. God ſent dreams, and men interpreted them. The gift of prophecy was common. And we read of ſeveral metamorphoſes, ſuch as of Nebuchadnezzar into an ox, of Lot's wife into a pillar of ſalt, and of five whole cities in an inſtant into a burning lake.

There were likewiſe ſeveral ſpecies of men that no longer exiſt. The race of giants, Rephaim, Emim, Nephilim, and Enacim, have totally diſappeared. St. Auguſtin, in his fifth book *de civitate Dei*, ſays, that he ſaw a tooth of one of thoſe ancient giants, that was at leaſt an hundred times as large as one of our grinders. Ezekiel ſpeaks of pigmies *(Gamadim)* not above a cubit high, who fought at the ſiege of Tyre; and

* *Ezekiel, chap. iv. ſeq.* † *Hoſea, chap. iii.*

almoſt

" to the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, " my ſervant †." Here then we have God declaring an idolatrous prince his ſervant and favourite.

The ſame prophet having been caſt into the dungeon by order of the Jewiſh king Zedekiah, and afterwards releaſed by him, adviſes him in the name of God, to ſubmit himſelf to the king of Babylon, ſaying, " If thou " wilt aſſuredly go forth unto the king of Babylon's " princes, thy ſoul ſhall live." God therefore takes parts with an idolatrous king, and delivers into his hands his holy ark, the looking upon which only, had coſt the lives of fifty thouſand and ſeventy Jews; and not only ſo, but alſo delivers up to him the Holy of Holies, together with the reſt of the temple, the building of which had coſt a hundred and eight thouſand talents of gold, one million ſeventeen thouſand talents of ſilver, and ten thouſand drachmas of gold, that had been left by David and his great officers, for building the houſe of the Lord; which, excluſive of the ſums expended for that purpoſe by king Solomon, amounts to the ſum of nineteen milliards; ſixty-two millions, or thereabouts of the preſent currency. Never ſure was idolatry ſo nobly rewarded. I am ſenſible that this account is exaggerated, and that it ſeems to be an error of the copyiſt. But if we reduce the ſum to one half, to a fourth, or even to an eighth part, it will ſtill be amazing. But Herodotus's account of the treaſures which he himſelf ſaw in the temple of Epheſus, is not leſs ſurpriſing. In fine, all the riches of the earth are as nothing in the ſight of God; and the title of *my ſervant*, with which he dignified Zebuchadnezzar, is the true and invaluable treaſure.

Not

almoſt all writers, ſacred and profane, have agreed in the truth of theſe relations.

In fine, the ancient world was ſo different from ours, that there is no drawing any rule for our conduct from it; and if in the earlieſt ages of antiquity we find mankind mutually perſecuting and deſtroying each other on account of their different faiths, far be it from us, who live under the enlightened law of grace, to copy after ſuch originals.

† Jer. xxvii. xxviii.

Nor does God ſhew leſs favour to Kyr, or Coſroes, whom we call Cyrus, and whom he calls his *Chriſt*, his *anointed*, though he never was anointed according to the general acceptation of that word, and was moreover a follower of the religion of Zoroaſter, and an uſurper in the opinion of the reſt of mankind; yet him he calleth his *ſhepherd** ; and we have not in the whole Sacred Writings, ſo great an inſtance of divine predilection.

We are told by the prophet Malachi, that "From "the riſing of the ſun even unto the going down of "the ſame, the name of God ſhall be great among "the Gentiles; and in every place a pure offering "ſhall be offered unto his name †." God takes as much care of the idolatrous Ninevites, as of his choſen Jews. Melchizedeck, though no Jew, was the high-prieſt of the living God. Balaam, though an idolater, was his prophet. The Holy Scripture then teaches us, that God not only tolerated every other religion, but alſo extended his fatherly care to them all. And ſhall we, after this, dare to be perſecutors?

CHAP. XIII.

The Great TOLERATION exerciſed among the JEWS.

THUS then, under Moſes, the Judges, and the Kings, we find numberleſs inſtances of toleration. Moreover, we are told by Moſes, that "God "will viſit the ſins of the fathers upon the chil-"dren, unto the third and fourth generation." This threat was neceſſary to a people to whom God had not revealed the immortality of the ſoul, and the rewards and puniſhment of a future ſtate. Theſe truths are not to be found in any part of the Decalogue, nor in the Levitic, or Deuteronomic law. They were the tenets of the Perſians, Babylonians, Egyptians,

* Iſai. chap. xliv. and xlv. † Malach. chap. i. v. 1.

Egyptians, Greeks, and Cretans; but made no part of the Jewiſh religion. Moſes does not ſay, "Honour thy father and thy mother, that thou mayeſt "inherit *eternal* life;" but "that thy days may be "long in the land, which the Lord thy God giveth "thee:" that is, in this life; and the puniſhments with which he threatens them, regard only the preſent mortal ſtate; ſuch as being ſmitten with the ſcab and with the itch; with blaſting and with mildew; that they ſhall betroth a wife, and another man ſhall lie with her; that they ſhall build houſes, and others ſhall dwell therein; that they ſhall plant vineyards, and ſhall not gather the grapes thereof; that they ſhall eat the fruit of their own bodies, the fleſh of their ſons, and of their daughters, and be obliged to bow down before the ſtranger that is within their gates *; but he never tells them that their ſouls are immortal, and ſhall taſte of felicity or puniſhment after death. God, who conducted his people himſelf, puniſhed or rewarded them immediately according to their good or evil deeds. Every thing relating to them was temporal, and this the learned biſhop Warburton brings as a proof of the divine origin of the Jewiſh law †; inaſmuch,

* Deut. chap. xxviii. ver. 28. & ſeq.

† There is but one paſſage in the whole Moſaic law, from which one might conclude, that Moſes was acquainted with the reigning opinion among the Egyptians, that the ſoul did not die with the body. This paſſage is very particular, and is in the eighteenth chapter of Deuteronomy: "There ſhall not be found "among you any one that uſeth divination, or an obſerver of "times, or an inchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a con-"ſulter with familiar ſpirits (Python), or a wizard, or a necro-"mancer." From this paſſage it appears, that, by invoking the ſouls of the dead, this pretended necromancy ſuppoſed a permanency of the ſoul. It might alſo happen, that the necromancers of whom Moſes ſpeaks, being but ignorant deceivers, might not have a diſtinct idea of the magic they operated. They made people believe, that they forced the dead to ſpeak, and by the power of their art reſtored the body to the ſame ſtate as when living; without once examining whether their ridiculous operations might authoriſe the doctrine of the immortality of the ſoul. The ancient magicians were never philoſophers, they were

much, ſays he, as God being their king, and exerciſing juſtice immediately upon them, according to their tranſgreſſion, or obedience, found it not neceſſary to reveal to them a doctrine which he reſerved for after-times, when he ſhould no longer ſo obediently govern his people. Thoſe who through ignorance pretend, that Moſes taught the immortality of the ſoul, deprived the New Teſtament of one of its principal advantages over the Old. It is certain, that the law of Moſes taught only temporal puniſhments, extending to the fourth generation; and yet, notwithſtanding the poſitive declaration of God delivered in this law, Ezekiel preached the very contrary to the Jews; telling them; "The ſon ſhall not bear the "iniquities of the father * †;" and in another place "he goes ſo far as to make God ſay, that he had "given

were at beſt but a ſet of ſtupid jugglers, who played their tricks before illiterate ſpectators.

But what is very ſtrange and worthy of obſervation is, that the word Python ſhould be found in Deuteronomy, ſo long before that Greek term was known to the Hebrews; and indeed, this word is not to be found in the Hebrew, of which we have never had a good tranſlation.

There are many inſurmountable difficulties in this language: it is a mixture of Phœnician, Egyptian, Syriac, and Arabic, and has undergone many alterations to the preſent time. The Hebrew verbs had only two moods, the preſent and the future: the reſt were to be gueſſed at by the ſenſe. The different vowels were frequently expreſſed by the ſame characters, or rather indeed they were not expreſſed at all; and the inventors of points have only increaſed the difficulties they meant to remove. Every adverb had twenty different ſignifications, and the ſame word had frequently ſeveral contrary ſenſes. Add to this, that the language was in itſelf very dry and barren; for the Jews, not being acquainted with the arts, could not expreſs what they knew nothing of. In a word, the Hebrew is to the Greek what the language of a pedant is to that of an academic.

* Ezek. chap. xvii. ver. 30.

† The opinion of Ezekiel was at length the prevailing one of the ſynagogue; not but that there were always ſome Jews, who, though they believed in a ſtate of eternal puniſhments, yet believed, at the ſame time, that God puniſhed the ſins of the fathers upon the children. At preſent indeed they are puniſhed even beyond the fiftieth generation, and yet are in danger

" given them ſtatutes that were not good, and judg-
" ments whereby they ſhould not live *."

Notwithſtanding theſe contradictions, the book of Ezekiel was not the leſs admitted into the number of theſe inſpired writers: it is true, that, according to St. Jerom, the ſynagogue did not permit the reading of it till after thirteen years of age; but that was for fear their youth ſhould make a bad uſe of the too lively deſcriptions in the ſixteenth and twenty-third chapters of the whoredoms of Aholah and Aholibah.

But when the immortality of the ſoul became to be a received doctrine †, which was probably about the beginning

of eternal puniſhment. It may be aſked how the offspring of thoſe Jews who were not concerned in putting Chriſt to death, can be temporally puniſhed in the perſons of their children who were as innocent as themſelves? This temporal puniſhment, or rather this manner of living, ſo different from all other people, and of trading over the whole earth without having any country of their own, cannot be conſidered as a puniſhment compared with what they are to expect hereafter on account of their unbelief, and which they might avoid by a ſincere repentance.

* Ezek. chap. xx. ver. 25.

† Thoſe who have thought to diſcover the doctrine of Hell and Heaven, ſuch as it is now believed by us, in the Moſaic books, have been ſtrangely miſtaken: their error is owing entirely to an idle diſpute about words: the Vulgate having tranſlated the Hebrew word *Sheol*, the pit, by the Latin word *infernum*, and this latter having been rendered in French by *enfer*, hell, they have taken occaſion from this equivocal tranſlation to eſtabliſh a belief that the ancient Hebrews had a notion of the *Hades* and *Tartarus* of the Greeks, known to other nations before them by different appellations.

We are told in the ſixteenth chapter of Numbers, that the earth opened her mouth and ſwallowed up Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, and they and all that appertained to them went down alive into the pit or grave; now certainly there is nothing ſaid in this paſſage concerning the ſouls of theſe three perſons, nor yet of the torments of Hell, nor of eternal puniſhments.

It is very extraordinary that the authors of the Dictionarie Encyclopedique under the word *Hell (Enfer)* ſhould ſay, that the ancient Hebrews believed in its exiſtence. If this is true, there would be an inſurmountable contradiction in the Pentateuch; for why ſhould Moſes have ſpoken of the puniſhments after death in one ſingle paſſage only, of all his works? On this occaſion

beginning of the Babyloniſh captivity, the ſect of Sadducees ſtill continued to believe, that there were no rewards

caſion they quote the thirty ſecond chapter of Deuteronomy; but after a mutilated manner. The whole paſſage is as follows: "They have moved me to jealouſy with that which is not God, "they have provoked me to anger with their vanities, and I "will move them to jealouſy with thoſe that are not a people, I "will provoke them to anger with a fooliſh nation. For a fire "is kindled in my anger, and ſhall burn unto the loweſt Hell; "and ſhall conſume the earth with her increaſe, and ſet on fire "the foundations of the mountains. I will heap miſchiefs upon them; I will ſpend mine arrows upon them. They ſhall "be burnt with hunger, and devoured with burning heat and "with bitter deſtruction; I will alſo ſend the teeth of beaſts "upon them, with the poiſon of ſerpents of the duſt."

But have any or all theſe expreſſions the leaſt relation to the idea of hell-torments? On the contrary, it ſeems as if theſe words were purpoſely inſerted to prove that our hell was unknown to the antient Jews.

The author of this article quotes alſo the following paſſage from the twenty-fourth chapter of Job, "The eye of the adulterer waiteth for the twilight, ſaying, no eye ſhall ſee me, "and diſguiſeth his face. In the dark they dig through houſes "which they had marked for themſelves in the day time. They "know not the light, for the morning is to them as the ſhadow "of death; if one know them, they are in the terrors of the "ſhadow of death. He is ſwift as the waters, their portion is "curſed in the earth, he beholdeth not the way of the vineyards. Drowth and heat conſume the ſnow-waters, ſo doth "the grave thoſe who have ſinned."

I quote theſe paſſages entire, otherwiſe it will be impoſſible to form a true idea of them. But let me aſk if there is the leaſt expreſſion here, from which one may conclude, that Moſes ever taught the Jews the clear and ſimple doctrine of eternal rewards and puniſhments?

Not to mention that the book of Job has nothing to do with the Moſaic law, there is great reaſon to believe that Job himſelf was not a Jew; this is the opinion of St. Jerom in his Hebrew queſtions upon Geneſis. The word Satan, which occurs in Job, was not known to the Jews, nor is it any where to be found in the five books of Moſes. This name as well as thoſe of Gabriel and Raphael, were entirely unknown to the Jews before their captivity in Babylon. It would appear then that Job is very improperly quoted in this place.

But the laſt chapter of Iſaiah is likewiſe brought in, where it is ſaid, "And it ſhall come to paſs, that from one new moon to "another, and from one ſabbath to another, ſhall all fleſh come

"to

wards or punishments after death, and that the faculties of the soul perished with us in like manner as those of the

" to worship before me, saith the Lord. And they shall go forth " and look upon the carcases of the men that have transgressed " against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their " fire be quenched, and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh."

Certainly, the casting out of these bodies to the view of all passengers, even to abhorring, and their being eaten by worms, can never mean that Moses taught the Jews the doctrine of the immortality of the soul; and the words, " The fire shall not be " quenched," can as little signify that the bodies, so exposed to public view, were to suffer eternal torments in hell.

How can any one quote a passage in Isaiah, to prove that the Jews in the time of Moses had adopted the doctrine of the immortality of the soul? According to the Hebrew computation, Isaiah prophesied about the year of the world three thousand three hundred and eighty. Moses lived about the year 2500 therefore there was a distance of eight centuries between the one and the other; now it is an insult upon common sense, a downright mockery, thus to abuse the license of quoting, by pretending to prove, that a writer was of this or that opinion, from a passage in another writer who lived eight hundred years after him, and who has not even made any mention of such opinion. It is beyond contradiction, that the immortality of the soul, and rewards and punishments after death, are clearly and positively expressed, and declared in the New-Testament, and it is equally certain, that nothing concerning them is to be found in any one part of the five books of Moses.

Notwithstanding that the Jews did afterwards embrace this doctrine; they were far from having a proper idea of the spirituality of the soul; they thought in common with most other nations, that the soul was an uncompounded aërial light substance, that retained the appearance of the body it had formerly animated; and hence came the term apparition, manes of the dead. Several fathers of the church were of the same opinion. Tertullian, in his twenty-second chapter, De Anima, expresses himself thus: " Definimus animam Dei flatu natam, " immortalem, corporalem, effigiatam, substantia simplicem;" that is, " We define the soul a substance, formed by the breath " of God of an immortal, corporeal, figurative, and simple na- " ture."

St. Ireneus in the thirty-fourth chapter of his second book, says, " Incorporales sunt animæ quantum ad comparitionem morta- " lium corporum," " souls are incorporeal in comparison of " mortal bodies." Adding, " Christ has taught us, that the " soul retains the image of the body;" " Caracterem corpo- " porum in quo adoptantur, &c." Christ does not appear ever to

the body. They alſo denied the exiſtence of angels. In a word they differed much more from the other Jews, than the Proteſtants do from the Catholics; nevertheleſs, they lived in peaceable communion with their brethren; and ſome of their ſect were admitted to the high prieſthood.

St. Hilary, in his commentary on St. Matthew, is ſtill more expreſs and poſitive; he roundly aſſerts the ſoul to have a corporeal ſubſtance, "Corpoream naturæ ſuæ "ſubſtantiam ſortiuntur."

St. Ambroſe on Abraham, book ii. chap viii. will have it that there is nothing free from matter, unleſs it be the ſubſtance of the Bleſſed Trinity.

Theſe reverend fathers ſeem to have been very indifferent philoſophers; but there is the greateſt reaſon to believe, that their divinity was in the main very ſound; inaſmuch, as notwithſtanding their ignorance of the incomprehenſible nature of the ſoul, they aſſerted it to be immortal, and endeavoured to make it Chriſtian.

We know that the ſoul is of a ſpiritual nature, but we do not all know what ſpirit is. We are very imperfectly acquainted with matter, nor is it poſſible for us to have a diſtinct idea of what is not matter. Hardly capable of underſtanding what effects our ſenſes have, we cannot of ourſelves know any thing of what ſurpaſſes the bound of thoſe ſenſes. We carry ſome few words of our common language into the inexplorable depths of metaphyſics and divinity, in order to acquire ſome ſlight idea of thoſe things, which we could never conceive or expreſs; and we uſe theſe words as props to ſupport the ſteps of our feeble underſtandings, in travelling through thoſe unknown regions.

Thus we make uſe of the word ſpirit, which is the ſame as breath or air, to expreſs ſomething which is not matter; and this word breath, air, ſpirit, inſpiring us inſenſibly with an idea of an uncompounded and light ſubſtance, we ſtill refine upon this as much as poſſible in order to obtain a proper conception of pure and ſimple

to have taught ſuch a doctrine, and it is difficult to underſtand what St. Ireneus means in this paſſage.

ſimple ſpirituality; but we ſhall never be able to obtain a diſtinct notion of this: we do not even know what we ſay, when we pronounce the word ſubſtance; in its literal ſignification, it ſignifies ſomething beneath, and thereby ſhews us that it is incomprehenſible; for what is meant by that which is beneath? The knowledge of the ſecrets of God is not to be acquired in this life. Plunged as we are in mortal obſcurity, we fight againſt each other, and ſtrike at random in the darkneſs with which we are ſurrounded, without preciſely knowing for what we are fighting.

If mankind would conſider all this with attention, every reaſonable perſon will be ready to conclude, that we ought to have the greateſt indulgence for the opinions of others, and by our conduct endeavour to merit the ſame from them.

The Phariſees held fatality or predeſtination*, and believed

The above remarks are not at all foreign to the principal point in queſtion, which is to know whether men are bound to tolerate each other; inaſmuch, as by proving that in all times thoſe of different opinions have been alike miſtaken, it appears to have been the duty of all mankind in every age, to treat each other with kindneſs and forbearance.

* The doctrine of predeſtination is both of long ſtanding and univerſal; we find it in Homer. Jupiter was deſirous to ſave the life of his ſon Sarpedon; but deſtiny had marked him for death, and Jupiter was obliged to ſubmit. Deſtiny was with the philoſophers either the neceſſary concatenation of cauſes and effects neceſſarily produced by nature, or that ſame concatenation ordained by providence; the latter of which is moſt reaſonable. We find the whole ſyſtem of fatality, or predeſtination compriz-ed in this line of Annæus Seneca: "Ducunt volentem fata, no-"lentem trahunt." It has been always acknowledged, that God governs the univerſe by eternal, univerſal, and immutable laws: this truth gave riſe to the many unintelligible diſputes concerning free-will, which had never been defined before the great philoſopher Locke aroſe, who has proved it to be the power of acting. God beſtows this power, and man, acting freely according to the eternal decrees of Providence, is one of the wheels of the great machine of the univerſe. Free-will has been a ſubject of diſputation from all antiquity; but no one 'till of late times, was ever perſecuted on this ſubject. How horrible, how abſurd is it to have impriſoned and baniſhed on account of this diſpute, a Pompone d'Andilly, an Arnaud, a Nicole, a Sacy, and ſo many others who were the ſhining lights of France?

believed in the Metempſichoſis *, the Eſſenians thought that the ſouls of the juſt went into ſome happy iſlands †, and thoſe of the wicked into a kind of Tartarus or Hell. They offered no ſacrifices; and aſſembled together in particular ſynagogues of their own. In a word, if we examine nicely into the Jewiſh oeconomy we ſhall be ſurprized to find the moſt extenſive toleration prevailing amidſt tne moſt ſhocking barbarities. This is indeed a contradiction, but almoſt all people have been governed by contradictions. Happy are thoſe whoſe manners are mild, while their laws are bloody!

CHAP.

* The Theological Romance of the Metempſichoſis came from India, a part of the world to which we are indebted for many more fables than is generally believed. We find this doctrine explained by that beautiful poet Ovid, in the twelfth book of his Metamorphoſes. It has been received in almoſt every part of the word, and has every where met with its oppoſers: nevertheleſs, we do not find that any prieſt among the ancients ever procured a diſciple of Pythagoras to be ſent to priſon.

† Neither the ancient Jews, the Egyptians, nor the Greeks, their cotemporaries, believed that the ſoul of man went to heaven after death. The Jews thought, that the ſun and moon were placed ſome leagues above us in the ſame circle, and that the firmament was a thick and ſolid vault, which ſupported the weight of the waters, that however ſometimes ran out through the crevices in this vault. The ancient Greeks placed the palace of their gods upon mount Olympus. And the abode of heroes after death was in Homer's time thought to be in an iſland beyond the ocean. This likewiſe was the opinion of the Eſſenians.

After Homer, planets were aſſigned to the gods; but there was no more reaſon for men to place a god in the moon, than for the inhabitants of the moon to place a god in our planet of the earth. Juno and Iris had no other palaces aſſigned them but the clouds, where there was no place to reſt the ſole of their feet. Among the Sabeans, every deity had its ſtar. But as the ſtars are little ſuns, it would be impoſſible to live there, without partaking of the nature of fire. Upon the whole, then, it is very needleſs to enquire what the ancients thought of heaven; ſince the beſt anſwer that can be given is, they thought nothing about it.

CHAP. XIV.

If NON-TOLERATION was taught by CHRIST.

LET us now ſee whether Chriſt eſtabliſhed ſanguinary laws, whether he enjoined non-toleration, inſtituted the horrors of the inquiſition, or the butchery of an Auto-da-fé.

There are, unleſs I am much miſtaken, very few paſſages in the New-Teſtament from which the ſpirit of perſecution can have inferred that tyranny and conſtraint in religious matters are permitted: one is the parable, wherein the kingdom of heaven is likened unto a certain king who made a marriage for his ſon, and ſent forth his ſervants to invite gueſts to the wedding, ſaying, "tell them which were bidden, my oxen and my "fatlings are killed, and all things are ready, come un-"to the marriage*." But thoſe that were bidden made light of the invitation, one going to his farm, and another to his buſineſs; and the reſt of them took the king's ſervants and ſlew them. Upon which he ſent forth his armies and deſtroyed thoſe murderers, and burnt up their city. After this he ſent out into the highways, to invite all that could be found to come to the marriage; but one of the gueſts happening to ſit down to table without a wedding-garment, the king ordered him to be bound hand and foot, and caſt into outer darkneſs.

But it is clear, that this allegory relates only to the kingdom of heaven; therefore, aſſuredly no man can aſſume a right from thence to fetter or impriſon his neighbour who ſhould come to dine with him, without being properly dreſſed; nor do I believe, thar hiſtory furniſhes us with any inſtance of a prince cauſing one of his courtiers to be hanged upon ſuch an occaſion: and there is little reaſon to apprehend, that when the emperor ſends his pages to any of the princes of the empire

* Matth. ch. xxii. v. 1—13.

empire to invite them to an entertainment, thoſe princes ſhould fall upon the pages and kill them.

The invitation to the marriage feaſt, is a type of the preaching of the goſpel; and the murder of the king's ſervants, is figurative of the perſecution of thoſe who preach wiſdom and virtue.

The other parable is that of a private perſon who made a great ſupper, to which he invited many of his friends *, and when he was ready to ſit down to table, ſent his ſervants to tell them that all things were ready; but one excuſed himſelf by ſaying, that he had bought a piece of ground, and muſt needs go and ſee it; an excuſe which was not admiſſible, as no one goes to viſit their lands in the night time; another ſaid he had bought five yoke of oxen, and was going to prove them; he was as much to blame as the other, ſince no one would go to prove oxen at ſupper time: the third ſaid he had married a wife, and could not come; this laſt was certainly a very good excuſe. The maſter of the houſe, being very angry at this diſappointment, told his ſervants to go into the ſtreets and lanes of the city, and bring in the poor and the maimed, the halt, and the blind; this being done, and finding that there was yet room, he ſaid unto his ſervant, "Go out into the "highways and hedges, and compel them (that you "find) to come in."

It is true, that we are not expreſsly told that this parable is a type of the kingdom of heaven, and the words "compel them to come in," have been perverted to very bad purpoſes; but it is very evident, that one ſingle ſervant could not *forcibly* compel every perſon he met to come and ſup with his maſter; beſides, the company of people ſo compelled would not have made the ſupper very agreeable. "Compel them to come "in," therefore, means nothing more, according to commentators of the beſt reputation, than pray, deſire, preſs them to come in; therefore what connection, for heaven-ſake, can prayers and invitations have with perſecution?

But

* St. Luke, chap. xiv.

But to take things in a literal ſenſe, is it neceſſary to be maimed, halt, and blind, or to be compelled by force to enter into the boſom of the church? Chriſt ſays in the ſame parable, "When thou makeſt a dinner, or a "ſupper, call not thy friends nor thy brethren, nor thy "rich kinſmen;" but did any one ever infer from thence, that we ſhould never dine or ſup with our friends or kinſmen, if they happen to be worth money?

Our Saviour, after this parable of the feaſt, ſays, "if any man come to me and hate not his father and "mother, his wife and children, his brethren and ſiſ-"ters, yea, and his own life alſo, he cannot be my "diſciple, &c." But is there any perſon living ſo unnatural to conclude from hence, that he ought to hate his father and mother and his neareſt relations? And is it not evident to one of the meaneſt capacity, that the true interpretation of theſe words is, heſitate not between me, and your deareſt affections?

The following paſſage in the eighth chapter of St. Matthew is alſo quoted; "Whoſoever heareth not the "word of God ſhall be like to an heathen, and like "one who ſitteth at the receipt of cuſtom;" but certainly, this is not ſaying that we ought to perſecute all unbelievers and cuſtom-houſe officers; they are frequently curſed indeed, but they are not delivered up to the arm of ſecular power. And ſo far from depriving the latter of any part of the prerogatives of citizens, they are indulged with the greateſt privileges; and though their profeſſion is the only one condemned in ſcripture, it is of all others the moſt protected and favoured by every government. Why then ſhould not we ſhow ſome indulgence to our brethren who are unbelievers, while we load with benefits our brethren the tax-gatherers?

Another paſſage which has been groſsly abuſed, is that in St. Matthew and St. Mark, where we are told that Jeſus being hungry in the morning, and coming to a fig-tree which had no leaves, (for it was not the time of figs) Jeſus curſed the tree, and it immediately dried up.

his

This miracle has been explained ſeveral different ways; but not one of them appears to authorize perſecution. Tho' a fig-tree could not be expected to bear fruit in the beginning of March, yet we find it blaſted: but is that a reaſon why we ſhould blaſt our brethren with affliction in all ſeaſons of the year? When we meet with any thing in holy writing that may occaſion doubts in our vain and inquiſitive minds, we ſhould pay it all due reverence, but let us not make uſe of it to countenance cruelty and perſecution.

The ſpirit of perſecution, which perverts every thing, has alſo ſtrained in its own vindication the ſtory of Chriſt driving the buyers and ſellers out of the temple, and that of his ſending a legion of devils out of the body of the man poſſeſſed with an evil ſpirit into two thouſand unclean animals; but cannot any one perceive, that theſe two inſtances were no other than acts of juſtice, which God himſelf deigned to execute for a contravention of his law? It was a diſreſpect ſhewn to the houſe of the Lord, to change his dwelling into a market for buyers and ſellers. And although the Sanhedrim and his prieſts might permit this traffic for the greater convenience of their ſacrifices; yet the God, to whom theſe ſacrifices were offered, might, doubtleſs, though under a human ſhape, overturn this profane practice. In the ſame manner might he puniſh thoſe who brought into the country whole troops of thoſe animals which were prohibited by that law, of which he himſelf deigned to be an obſerver. Theſe two examples then have not the leaſt connection with perſecution for religion-ſake; and the ſpirit of non-toleration muſt certainly be founded upon very falſe principles, when it every where ſeeks ſuch idle pretexts.

Chriſt, in almoſt every other part of his goſpel both by his words and actions, preaches up mildneſs, forbearance, and indulgence. Witneſs the father who receives his prodigal ſon; and the workman who comes at the laſt hour, and yet is paid as much as the others; witneſs the charitable Samaritan; and Chriſt himſelf, who excuſes his diſciples for not faſting; who pardons the woman who had ſinned; and only recommends fidelity

for

for the future to the woman caught in adultery. He even condeſcends to partake of the innocent mirth of thoſe who are met at the marriage feaſt in Cana, and who being already warmed with wine, and wanting ſtill more, Chriſt is pleaſed to perform a miracle in their favour, by changing their water into wine. He is not even incenſed againſt Judas, whom he knew to be about to betray him; he commands Peter never to make uſe of the ſword, and reprimands the ſons of Zebedee, who, after the example of Elias, wanted to call down fire from heaven to conſume a town in which they had been refuſed a lodging. In a word, he himſelf died a victim to malice and perſecution; and, if one might dare to compare God with a mortal, and ſacred things with prophane, his death, humanly ſpeaking, had a great reſemblance to that of Socrates. The Greek philoſopher ſuffered by the hatred of the ſophiſts, the prieſts and the heads of the people; the Chriſtian law-giver by that of the Scribes, Phariſees and prieſts. Socrates might have avoided death, but would not: Chriſt offered himſelf a voluntary ſacrifice. The Greek philoſopher not only pardoned his falſe accuſers and iniquitous judges, he even deſired them to treat his children as they had done himſelf, ſhould they be one day happy enough, like him, to deſerve their hatred. The Chriſtian law-giver, infinitely ſuperior to the heathen, beſought his father to forgive his enemies. If Chriſt ſeemed to fear death, and that the agonies he was in at its approach, drew from him ſweat mixed with blood, which is the moſt violent and rare of all ſymptoms, it was becauſe he condeſcended to ſubmit to every weakneſs of the human frame which he had taken upon him; his body trembled, but his ſoul was unſhaken. By his example we may learn, that true fortitude and greatneſs conſiſt in ſupporting thoſe evils at which our nature ſhrinks. It is the height of courage to meet death at the ſame time that we fear it.

Socrates accuſed the ſophiſts of ignorance, and convicted them of falſhood: Jeſus, in his Godlike character, accuſed the Scribes and Phariſees of being hypocrites,

crites, blind guides and fools, and a race of vipers and ſerpents.

Socrates was not accuſed of attempting to found a new ſect; nor was Chriſt charged with endeavouring to introduce a new one. We are told in St. Matthew, that the great men and the prieſts, and all the council, ſought falſe witneſs againſt Jeſus to put him to death.

Now, if they were obliged to ſeek for falſe witneſſes, they could not charge him with having preached openly againſt the law; beſides, it was evident, that he complied in every reſpect with the Moſaic law, from his birth to his death. He was circumciſed the eighth day like other Jewiſh children; he was baptized in Jordan, agreeable to a ceremony held ſacred among the Jews, and among all the other people of the eaſt. All impurities of the law were cleanſed by baptiſm; it was in this manner their prieſts were conſecrated at the ſolemn feaſt of the expiation, every one plunged himſelf in the water, and all new-made proſelytes underwent the ſame ceremony.

Moreover, Jeſus obſerved all the points of the law; he feaſted every ſabbath-day, and he abſtained from forbidden meats; he kept all the feſtivals, and even before his death he celebrated that of the paſſover; he was not accuſed of embracing any new opinion, nor of obſerving any ſtrange rites. Born an Iſraelite, he always lived as an Iſraelite.

He was accuſed indeed by two witneſſes, of having ſaid that he could deſtroy the temple, and build it up again in three days; a ſpeech altogether unintelligible to the carnal Jews, but which did not amount to an accuſation of ſeeking to found a new ſect.

When he was examined before the high-prieſt, this latter ſaid to him, "I command you, in the name of "the living God, to tell us if thou art Chriſt, the ſon "of God." We are not told what the high-prieſt meant by the ſon of God. This expreſſion was ſometimes made uſe of to ſignify a juſt or upright man *, in the

* It was indeed very difficult, not to ſay impoſſible, for the Jews to comprehend, without an immediate revelation, the ineffable

the ſame manner as the words ſon of Belial, to ſignify a wicked perſon. The carnal Jews had no idea of the ſacred myſtery of the ſon of God, God himſelf, coming upon earth.

Jeſus anſwered the high-prieſt, "thou haſt ſaid; "nevertheleſs, I ſay unto you, hereafter ſhall ye ſee "the ſon of man ſitting on the right hand of the "power of God, and coming in the clouds of hea-"ven †."

This anſwer was looked upon by the whole aſſembly as a blaſphemy. But the Sanhedrim having no longer the power of life and death, they falſely accuſed Jeſus before the Roman governor of the province, of being a a diſturber of the public peace, and one who ſaid they ſhould not pay tribute to Cæſar; and moreover, called himſelf king of the Jews. It is therefore inconteſtibly evident, that he was accuſed of a crime againſt the ſtate.

Pilate being informed that he was a Galilean, ſent him immediately to Herod, the tetrach of Galilee. This latter thinking it impoſſible that a perſon of Jeſus's appearance ſhould pretend to be the head of a party, or aſpire to royalty, treated him with great contempt, and ſent him back again to Pilate, who had the infamous weakneſs to condemn him to death, as the only means to appeaſe the tumult raiſed againſt himſelf; more eſpecially as he had lately experienced the revolt of the Jews, as we are told by Joſephus. On this occaſion Pilate did

effable myſtery of the incarnation of God, the ſon of God. In the ſixth chapter of Geneſis, we find the ſons of great men called "the ſons of God." In like manner the royal Pſalmiſt calls the tall cedars, "the cedars of God." Samuel ſays, "the fear "of God fell upon the people;" that is, a violent fear ſeized them. A great tempeſt is called the wind of the Lord, and Saul's diſtemper, the melancholy of the Lord. Nevertheleſs, the Jews ſeemed to have clearly underſtood that our Saviour called himſelf the ſon of God in the proper ſenſe of that word; and if they looked upon this as a blaſphemous expreſſion, it is an additional proof of their ignorance of the incarnation, and of God, the ſon of God, being ſent upon earth for the redemption of mankind.

† Matthew, chap. xxvi. ver. 61—64.

not ſhow the ſame generoſity which the governor Feſtus did afterwards.

I now deſire to know, whether toleration or non-toleration appears to be of divine preſcription? Let thoſe who would reſemble Chriſt, be martyrs, and not executioners.

CHAP. XV.

TESTIMONIES againſt PERSECUTION.

IT is an impious act to deprive men of liberty in matters of religion, or prevent them from making choice of a God. No God nor man would be pleaſed with a forced ſervice. (*Apologetic* chap. xxiv.)

Was violence to be uſed in defence of the faith, the biſhops would oppoſe it. (*St. Hilarius*, lib. i.)

Religion when forced ceaſes to be religion; we ſhould perſuade and not compel. Religion cannot be commanded. (*Lactantius*, lib. iii.)

It is deteſtable hereſy to endeavour to bring over by violence, bodily puniſhments, or impriſonments, thoſe whom we cannot convince by reaſoning. (*St. Athanaſius.* lib. i.)

Nothing is more contradictory to true religion than conſtraint. (*St. Juſtin Martyr*, lib. v.)

Is it for us to perſecute thoſe whom God tolerates? ſaid St. Auguſtin, before his diſpute with the Donatiſts had ſoured his diſpoſition.

Let no violence be done to the Jews. (*The 56th Canon of the 4th Council of Toledo.*)

Adviſe but compel not. (*St. Barnard's Letters.*)

We do not pretend to overcome error by violence. (*Speech of the Clergy of France to Lewis XIV.*)

We have always diſapproved of rigorous meaſures. (*Aſſembly of the Clergy, Auguſt* 11, 1560.)

We know that faith may yield to perſuaſion, but it never will be controuled. (*Flechier biſhop of Nime's Letter*, 19.)

We ought to abſtain even from reproachful ſpeeches. (*Biſhop Balley's Paſtoral Letters.*)

Remember

Remember that the diſeaſes of the ſoul are not to be cured by reſtraint and violence. *(Cardinal Camus' Paſtoral Inſtructions for the Year* 1588.)

Indulge every one with civil toleration. *(Archbiſhop Fenelon to the Duke of Burgundy.)*

Compulſion in religion proves the ſpirit, which dictates it, to be an enemy to truth. *(Dirois, a Doctor of the Sorbonne,* b. vi. chap. iv.*)*

Compulſion may make hypocrites, but never can perſuade. *(Tellement's Hiſt. Eccleſ. tom.* vi.

We have thought it conformable to equity and right reaſon, to walk in the paths of the antient church, which never uſed violence to eſtabliſh or extend religion. *(Remonſtrance of the Parliament of Paris to Henry II.)*

Experience teaches us, that violence is more likely to irritate, than to cure a diſtemper which is ſeated in the mind. *(De Thou's Epiſtle Dedicatory to Henry IV.)*

Faith is not inſpired by the edge of the ſword. (*Ceresier in the Reigns of Henry IV. and Lewis XIII.)*

It is a barbarous zeal which pretends to force any religion upon the mind, as if perſuaſion could be produced by conſtraint. (*Boulainvillier's State of France.)*

It is with religion as with love; command can do nothing, conſtraint ſtill leſs; nothing is ſo independent as love and belief. *(Amelot de la Houſſaie on Cardinal Oſſat's Letters.)*

If providence has been ſo kind to you as to give you a knowledge of the truth, receive it as an inſtance of his great goodneſs; but ſhould thoſe who enjoy the inheritance of their father hate thoſe who do not? *(Spirit of Laws,* book xxv.)

One might compoſe an immenſe volume of ſuch paſſages. All our hiſtories, diſcourſes, ſermons, moral treatiſes, and catechiſms of the preſent time, abound with, and inculcate this holy doctrine of indulgence. What fatality, what falſe reaſon, then leads us to contradict, by our practice, the theory we are every day teaching? When our actions give the lie to our morals, it muſt certainly proceed from our thinking it our intereſt to practiſe the contrary of what we teach; but

what advantage can ariſe from perſecuting thoſe who do not think in the ſame manner as we do, and thereby make ourſelves hated by them? Once more then, let me repeat it, there is the higheſt abſurdity in perſecution. It may be replied, that thoſe who found it their intereſt to lay a reſtraint upon the conſciences others are not ſo abſurd in ſo doing. To ſuch men I addreſs the following chapter.

CHAP. XVI.

A CONVERSATION between a DYING MAN, and one in good Health.

AN inhabitant of a country village, lying at the point of death, was viſited by a perſon in good health, who came to inſult him in his laſt moments with the following ſpeech.

Wretch, that thou art! think as I do this inſtant, ſign this writing immediately, confeſs that five propoſitions are to be found in a book that neither thou nor I have ever read; adopt immediately the opinion of Lanfranc againſt Berengarius, and of St. Thomas againſt St. Bonaventure; join with the council of Nice againſt the council of Frankfort; and explain to me out of hand, how the words, "My father is greater than "me," ſignify exactly, "I am as great as him." Tell me alſo in what manner the father communicates all his attributes to the ſon, excepting the fatherhood; or I will have thy body thrown to the fowls of the air, thy children deprived of their inheritance, thy wife of her dowry, and thy family turned out to beg their bread, which ſhall be refuſed them by thoſe who are like myſelf.

DYING MAN.

I ſcarce underſtand what you ſay; your threats ſtrike my ears confuſedly, they trouble my mind, and render

render my laſt moments terrifying. In the name of God have pity on me!

CRUEL MAN.

Pity! I can have none for thee, unleſs thou art exactly of my opinion.

DYING MAN.

Alas! you muſt be ſenſible that in theſe my laſt moments, my ſenſes are all impaired, the doors of my underſtanding are ſhut, my ideas are loſt in confuſion, and I have hardly any ſentiments remaining. Am I then in a condition to diſpute?

CRUEL MAN.

Well then, if thou canſt not believe as I would have thee, only ſay that you do, and that will content me.

DYING MAN.

How! would you have me perjure myſelf, to pleaſe you, when I am going in an inſtant to appear before the judgment-ſeat of that God who is the avenger of perjury?

CRUEL MAN.

No matter; thou wilt have the pleaſure to be interred in holy ground, and thy wife and children will have wherewithal to maintain them after thy death. Die an hypocrite: hypocriſy is a very good thing; I have heard ſay, it is the homage which vice pays to virtue. A little hypocriſy, friend, can't coſt you much?

DYING MAN.

Surely, you muſt either not acknowledge a God, or hold him very cheap, ſince you require me to tell a lie

with my laſt breath, when you yourſelf muſt ſoon appear in judgment before him, and anſwer for that lie.

CRUEL MAN.

Inſolent wretch! doſt thou ſay that I do not acknowledge a God?

DYING MAN.

Pardon me, brother, I rather fear you do not know him. The God whom I adore, lends me this time an increaſe of ſtrength, to tell you with my dying words, that if you believe in him, you ought to behave towards me with charity. He has given me my wife and children, do not you make them periſh with miſery. As for my body. do with it as ſeems good to you; I leave it at your diſpoſal; but let me conjure you to believe in God.

CRUEL MAN.

Come, come, truce with your reaſoning, and do as I bid you; I will have it ſo; I command you to do it.

DYING MAN.

But what advantage can you have in thus tormenting me?

CRUEL MAN.

What advantage! why, if I can make you ſign, it will be worth a good canonſhip to me.

DYING MAN.

Ah! brother; my laſt moment approaches; I am expiring; but I will pray to God to touch your heart, that you may be converted.

CRUEL

CRUEL MAN.

The devil take the impertinent puppy he has not ſigned after all! Well, I'll e'en ſign for him, it is but a little forgery.

The following letter is a confirmation of the above doctrine.

CHAP. XVII.

A LETTER from a Beneficed Prieſt, to Father LE TELLIER, the Jeſuit, dated the 6th of May, 1714.

Reverend Father,

THE following is in obedience to the orders I received from your reverence, to lay before you the moſt effectual means for delivering Jeſus and his company from their enemies.

I believe there may be remaining at this time in the kingdom not more than five hundred thouſand Hugonots, ſome ſay a million, others a miilion and a half; but let the number be what it will, the following is my advice; which, however, as in duty bound, I ſubmit with all humility to your reverence's judgment.

In the firſt place then, it will be very eaſy to ſeize in one day all the preachers, and to hang them all at one time and in one place, which will not only be a very edifying, but alſo a very entertaining exhibition to the people.

Secondly, I would have all the fathers and mothers who are heretics murdered in their beds, becauſe the killing them in the ſtreets might occaſion ſome little diſturbance; beſides, by that means ſeveral of them might eſcape, which is above all to be prevented. This execution is a neceſſary corollary of our principles; for if we ought to kill a heretic, as ſo many of our great divines have inconteſtibly proved, it is evident, that we ought to kill them all without exception.

Thirdly, I would, the very next day, marry all the daughters to good catholics, inaſmuch as it would not be politic to depopulate the ſtate ſo much after the late war; but as for the boys of fourteen and fifteen years of age, who have already imbibed bad principles, which we cannot hope to root out, 'tis my opinion that they ſhould be all caſtrated, to prevent the race from being ever reproduced. As for the other younger lads they may be brought up in our colleges, where they may be whipped till they have learnt by heart the works of Sanchez and Molinos.

Fourthly, I think, under correction, the ſame method ought to be taken with all the Lutherans of Alſace, for I remember in the year 1704, to have ſeen two old women of that country laugh on the day of our defeat at Blenheim.

Fifthly, What relates to the Janſeniſts will perhaps appear a little more difficult: I believe their numbers may amount to about ſix millions, a little more or leſs; but this ought not to give any alarm to a perſon of your reverence's diſpoſition. I reckon among the Janſeniſts all the parliaments who have ſo unworthily maintained the liberties of the Gallican church. I leave it to your reverence to weigh with your uſual prudence, the moſt effectual methods for reducing theſe turbulent ſpirits. The gun-powder plot failed of the deſired ſucceſs, thro' the weakneſs of one of the conſpirators, who wanted to ſave the life of his friend: but, as your reverence has no friend the ſame inconvenience is not to be apprehended; you may very eaſily blow up all the parliaments in the kingdom with the compoſition called Pulvis Pyrius, invented by the monk Schwartz. By my calculation, it will require upon an average thirty-ſix barrels of powder for each of the parliaments; now if we multiply thirty-ſix, the number of barrels, by twelve the number of parliaments, it will make four hundred and thirty-two barrels, which, at a hundred crowns per barrel, will amount to not quite a hundred and thirty thouſand livres; a mere trifle for the reverend father-general.

The

The parliaments thus diſpoſed of, you may beſtow their places upon your congregationiſts, who are perfectly well verſed in the laws of the realm.

Sixthly, It will be a very eaſy matter to poiſon the cardinal de Noailles, who is a very ſimple unſuſpecting man.

Your reverence may take the ſame ſteps for converſion with ſeveral of the refractory prelates, and their biſhoprics, by a brief from the pope, may be put into the hands of the Jeſuits: thus all the biſhops that remain being ſtaunch to the good cauſe, and they making a proper choice of curates, I, with your reverence's permiſſion, would give the following advice:

Seventhly and laſtly, As the Janjeniſts are ſaid to take the ſacrament one time in the year at leaſt, which is at Eaſter, it would not be amiſs to ſeaſon the conſecrated wafers with a little of that drug which was uſed to do juſtice upon the emperor Henry VII. Some nice caviler may perhaps tell me, that in this operation we may run ſome riſque in poiſoning the Moliniſts at the ſame time; there is ſome weight in this objection: but then it ſhould be conſidered, that there is no project without its inconveniencies; nor any ſyſtem but what threatens deſtruction in ſome part. And if we were to be ſtopped by theſe little difficulties, we ſhould never attain our end in any thing; beſides, as here we have in view the obtaining the greateſt of all poſſible advantages, we ſhould not ſuffer ourſelves to be ſhocked, though it brings with it ſome bad conſequences, eſpecially as thoſe conſequences are of little or no conſideration.

And after all, we ſhall have nothing to reproach ourſelves with, ſince it is proved, that the Reformed, as they call themſelves, and the Janſeniſts, have all of them their portion in hell; therefore, we only put them in poſſeſſion of their inheritance a little the ſooner.

It is as evident, that heaven belongs of right to the Moliniſts; therefore by deſtroying them by miſtake, and without any evil intention, we haſten their happineſs; and are in both caſes the miniſters of providence.

As

As to thoſe who may be a little ſhocked at the number to be thus made away with, your reverence may remark to them, that from the firſt flouriſhing days of the church to the year 1707, that is to ſay, in about fourteen hundred years, religion has occaſioned the maſſacre of upwards of fifty millions of perſons; whereas by my propoſal, not above ſix millions and a half will be put to death by the halter, the dagger, or poiſon.

But perhaps it may be objected, that my calculation is not juſt, and that I have committed an error againſt the Rule of Three; inaſmuch, as, that if in fourteen hundred years, there periſhed fifty millions of ſouls, on account of ſome trifling diſputes in divinity, that makes only thirty-five thouſand ſeven hundred and fourteen, and ſome little fraction in a year, and conſequently, that by my method an overplus of ſix millions ſixty-four thouſand two hundred and eighty-five and ſome fractions are put to death in the current year. But indeed, this is a very childiſh quibble: nay, I'll even call it impious: for is it not plain, that by my method, I ſave the lives of all the Catholics, ſo long as the world ſhall laſt? But in ſhort, there would be no end of anſwering every frivolous objection.

I am,
With the moſt profound Reſpect,
Reverend Father,
Your Reverence's
Moſt humble,
Moſt devout
And moſt humane R——
Native of Angoulême,
Prefect of the Congregation.

This glorious ſcheme however could not be carried into execution, becauſe it required a conſiderable time to make the neceſſary diſpoſitions, and that father Le Tellier was baniſhed the year following. But as it is right to examine both ſides of an argument, it will be proper to inquire in what caſes it may be lawful to follow in part the ſcheme of the reverend father's correſpondent. It would ſeem rather too ſevere to execute it

in all its parts: let us therefore examine in what caſes we ought to break upon the wheel, to hang, or to make galley ſlaves of thoſe who differ from us in opinion. This ſhall be the ſubject of the following chapter.

CHAP. XVIII.

The only CASES in which NON-TOLERATION makes Part of the Human Law.

FOR a government not to have a right to puniſh men for their errors, it is neceſſary that thoſe errors ſhould not be crimes; and they are crimes only when they diſturb the public tranquillity; which they do whenever they inſpire enthuſiaſm: it is neceſſary therefore that men ſhould begin by laying aſide enthuſiaſm, in order to deſerve toleration.

If a number of young Jeſuits, knowing that the church holds all reprobates and heretics in deteſtation, and that the opinion of the Janſeniſts having been condemned by a bull, this ſect is conſequently reprobate; thereupon go and ſet fire to the houſe of the fathers of the oratory, becauſe Queſnel one of that body was a Janſeniſt; it is clear, that the government would be obliged to puniſh thoſe Jeſuits.

In like manner, if theſe latter have been found to teach the moſt reprehenſible doctrines, and if their inſtitution appears contrary to the laws of the kingdom, it becomes neceſſary to aboliſh their ſociety, and of Jeſuits to make them uſeful citizens: which, in fact, ſo far from being an oppreſſion upon them, as has been pretended, is a real-good done them; for where is the great oppreſſion of being obliged to wear a ſhort coat inſtead of a long gown, or to be free inſtead of being a ſlave? In time of peace, whole regiments are broke without complaining; why then ſhould the Jeſuits make ſuch an outcry, when they are broke for the ſake of peace?

Were the Franciſcans, in a tranſport of holy zeal for the Virgin Mary, to go and pull down the church of the Dominicans,

Dominicans, who hold Mary to have been born in original ſin, the government would then be obliged to treat the Franciſcans much in the ſame manner it has done the Jeſuits.

The ſame argument will hold good with regard to the Lutherans and Calviniſts; for let them ſay, if they pleaſe, we follow the dictates of our conſciences, it is more profitable to obey God than man; we are the only true flock, and therefore ought to cut off all the wolves. It is evident that in this caſe they themſelves are the wolves.

One of the moſt aſtoniſhing examples of enthuſiaſm, was in a little ſect of Denmark, founded on one of the beſt principles in the world; for theſe people endeavoured to procure the eternal happineſs of all their brethren: but the conſequences of this principle were very ſingular. As they believe that all the young children who died without baptiſm were damned, and that thoſe who had the happineſs to die immediately after the receiving that ſacrament, enter into eternal happineſs, they went forth and murdered all the young children of both ſexes lately baptized whom they could meet with; by this action, they doubtleſs procured the little innocents the greateſt of all felicity, by preſerving them at once from ſin, the miſeries of this life, and hell, and ſending them infallibly to heaven. But theſe people, in the exceſs of their charitable zeal, did not conſider that it is forbidden to do evil that good may come thereof; that they had no right over the lives of theſe infants; that the greateſt part of fathers and mothers are ſo carnal, as to deſire rather to keep their children about them, than to ſee their throats cut, though it was to ſend them to heaven; and laſtly, that it is the duty of the magiſtrate to puniſh murder, though committed with a good intent.

It ſhould ſeem that the Jews had the greateſt right of any perſons to rob and murder us: for although the Old Teſtament abounds with examples of toleration and indulgence, yet are there ſeveral inſtances of the contrary, and ſome very ſevere laws. God did at times command his people to kill all idolaters, reſerving only the

the young women fit for the nuptial ſtate: they look upon us as idolaters; and notwithſtanding that we at preſent tolerate them, they might certainly, had they the power in their hands, cut us all off, excepting our young women.

Moreover, they would be under an indiſpenſable obligation to exterminate the whole Turkiſh race; this ſpeaks itſelf; for the Turks are at preſent in poſſeſſion of the countries of the Hittites, the Jebuſites, the Amorites, the Girgaſhites, &c. &c. All which people were laid under a curſe, and all their country, which was about five and twenty leagues in extent, was given to the Jews by ſeveral ſucceſſive covenants; conſequently they ought to reſume poſſeſſion of their own, which the Turks have uſurped from them for upwards of a thouſand years. But if the Jews were to reaſon in this manner now-a-days, it is pretty certain we ſhould make them no other anſwer, but by impaling them alive.

Theſe are the only cauſes in which perſecution appears reaſonable.

CAAP. XIX.

ACCOUNT of a Controverſial Diſpute which happened in CHINA.

IN the beginning of the reign of the great emperor Cam-hi, a mandarin of the city of Canton hearing a great noiſe and outcry in the houſe adjoining to that he dwelt in, ſent to know if they were murdering any one; but was told that it was only a Daniſh almoner, a Dutch chaplain, and a Jeſuit diſputing together; upon which he ordered them to be brought before him, and enquired of them the occaſion of their quarrel?

The Jeſuit, who was the firſt that ſpoke, ſaid, that it was a very grievous thing to him, who was always in the right, to have to do with people who were always in the wrong; that he had at firſt began to reaſon with them with the greateſt coolneſs; but that, at length,

length, he could not but own his patience had left him.

The mandarin then repreſented to all three, with all imaginable candour, how neceſſary it was to obſerve decorum and good manners even in diſputation; he told them that no one ever gave way to heats or paſſion in China, and deſired to be informed of the nature of their diſpute?

My lord, ſaid the Jeſuit, I take you for judge in this affair. Theſe two gentlemen refuſe to ſubmit to the deciſions of the council of Trent.

I am ſurpriſed at that, replied the Mandarin. Then turning towards the two refractory parties, Gentlemen, ſaid he, you ought to ſhew a deference to the opinion of a great aſſembly; I do not know what the council of Trent is; but a number of perſons muſt always have opportunities of knowing better than one ſingle man. No one ought to imagine that he knows more than all others, and that reaſon dwells only with him: this is the doctrine of our great Confucius; therefore, if you would take my advice, abide by what the council of Trent has decreed.

The dane then began to ſpeak in his turn. Your Excellence, ſaid he, has delivered yourſelf with great wiſdom and prudence: we have all that reſpect for great aſſemblies that we ought; and accordingly we ſubmit entirely to the opinions of ſeveral councils that were held at the ſame time with that of Trent.

Oh! if that is the caſe, ſaid the Mandarin, I aſk your pardon, you may doubtleſs be in the right. So then, it ſeems you and the Dutchman are of one opinion againſt the Jeſuit.

Not in the leaſt, anſwered the Dutchman, this man here (pointing to the Dane) entertains notions almoſt as extravagant as thoſe of the Jeſuit, who pretends to ſo much mildneſs before you. 'Sblood! there is no bearing this with patience.

I cannot conceive what you mean, ſaid the Mandarin; are you not all three Chriſtians? are you not all three come to teach the Chriſtian religion in our empire?

pire? and ought you not conſequently to have all the ſame tenets?

You ſee how it is, my lord, ſaid the Jeſuit: theſe two men here are mortal enemies to each other; and yet both of them diſpute againſt me; this makes it clear, that they are both in the wrong, and that reaſon is on my ſide. I do not think it ſo very clear, replied the Mandarin, for it may very well happen that you are all three in the wrong. But I ſhould be glad to hear your arguments ſingly.

The Jeſuit then made a long diſcourſe, while the Dutchman and the Dane at every period ſhrugged up their ſhoulders, and the Mandarin could not make any thing of what he heard. The Dane now took the lead in his turn, while his two adverſaries looked upon him with manifeſt ſigns of contempt; and the Mandarin, when he had finiſhed, remained as wiſe as before. The Dutchman had the ſame ſucceſs. At length they began to talk all three together, and broke out into the moſt ſcurrilous revilings. The honeſt Mandarin could hardly get in a word; at length he diſmiſſed them, ſaying, If you expect to have your doctrine tolerated here, begin by ſhewing an example of it to each other.

At leaving the houſe, the Jeſuit met with a Dominican miſſionary, to whom he related what had paſſed; and told him, that he had gained his cauſe; for you may be aſſured, added he, that truth will always prevail. The Dominican replied, Had I been there, friend, you would not ſo eaſily have gained your cauſe; for I ſhould have proved you to be an idolater and a liar. Upon this, there aroſe a violent diſpute between them; and the Jeſuit and the Friar went to fifty-cuffs. The Mandarin being informed of this ſcandalous behaviour, ordered them both to be ſent to priſon. A ſub-mandarin aſked his Excellence, how long he would pleaſe to have them remain in confinement? Till they are both agreed, ſaid the judge. Then, my lord, anſwered the ſub-mandarin, they will remain in priſon all their days. Well then, ſaid the Mandarin, let them ſtay till they forgive one another. That they will never

ver do, rejoined the deputy, I know them very well. Indeed! ſaid the Mandarin; then let it be till they appear ſo to do.

CHAP. XX.

Whether it is of Service to indulge the People in SUPERSTITION.

SUCH is the weakneſs and perverſity of the human race, that it is undoubtedly more eligible for them to be ſubject to every poſſible kind of ſuperſtition, provided it is not of a bloody nature, than to live without religion. Man has always ſtood in need of a curb; and though it was certainly very ridiculous to ſacrifice to fauns, ſatyrs, and naiads, yet it was more reaſonable and advantageous to adore even thoſe fantaſtic images of the Deity, than to be given up to atheiſm. An atheiſt of any capacity, and inveſted with power, would be as dreadful a ſcourge to the reſt of mankind, as the moſt bloody enthuſiaſt.

When men have not true notions of the Deity, falſe ideas muſt ſupply their place, like as in troubleſome and calamitous times, we are obliged to trade with baſe money when good is not to be procured. The heathens were afraid of committing crimes, leſt they ſhould be puniſhed by their falſe gods. The Malabar dreads the anger of his pagods. Wherever there is a fixed community, religion is neceſſary; the laws are a curb upon open crimes, and religion upon private ones.

But when once men have embraced a pure and holy religion, ſuperſtition then becomes not only needleſs, but very hurtful. Thoſe whom God has been pleaſed to nouriſh with bread, ought not to be fed upon acorns.

Superſtition is to religion what aſtrology is to aſtronomy, the fooliſh daughter of a wiſe mother. Theſe two daughters however have, for a long time, governed this world with uncontroulable ſway.

In

In thoſe dark and barbarous times amongſt us, when there were hardly two feudal lords who had a New-Teſtament in their houſes, it might be pardonable to preſent the common people with fables; I mean thoſe feudal lords, their ignorant wives, and brutiſh vaſſals. They were then made to believe, that St. Chriſtopher carried the child Jeſus on his ſhoulders from one ſide of the river to the other: they were entertained with ſtories of witches and withcraft; they readily believed that St. Genou cured the gout, and St. Clara ſore eyes. The children believed in hobgoblins, and their fathers in St. Francis' girdle; and relicks ſwarmed out of number.

The common people have continued to be infected with the ruſt of theſe ſuperſtitions, even after religion became more enlightened. It is well known that when Mr. de Noailles, biſhop of Chalons, ordered the pretended relick of the holy navel to be taken away and thrown into the fire, the whole city of Chalons joined in a proſecution againſt him, but he, who had reſolution equal to his piety, ſoon brought the people of his dioceſe to believe, that one may adore Jeſus Chriſt in ſpirit and in truth, without having his navel in a church.

Thoſe whom we call Janſeniſts were not a little inſtrumental in rooting out by degrees, from the minds of the greateſt part of the nation, the many abſurd notions which were the diſgrace of our holy religion. And it no longer continued to be thought ſufficient to repeat the prayer of thirty days to the bleſſed Virgin, to obtain whatever one ſhould aſk, and ſin with impunity.

At length, the lower kind of people began to imagine, that it was not St Geneviéve who gave rain or cauſed it to ceaſe, but God himſelf, who diſpoſed the elements according to his good will and pleaſure. The monks have been aſtoniſhed to find their ſaints no longer perform miracles; and if the writers of the life of St. Francis Xavier were to come again into the world, they would not venture to aſſert, that their ſaint raiſed nine people from the dead; that he was at one and the ſame time,

time, both on the ſea and on ſhore; or that a crab brought him his crucifix, which he had dropped out of his hand into the water.

It has happened much the ſame with regard to excommunications. Our French hiſtorians tell us, that when king Robert was excommunicated by pope Gregory V. for having married the princeſs Bertha, who was his god-mother, his domeſtics threw all the victuals that came from his table out of the windows, and that his queen Bertha was delivered of a gooſe, as a puniſhment for this inceſtuous alliance. It is not likely that the pages of the preſence to a king of France now-a-days, would throw his dinner into the ſtreets if he ſhould be excommunicated; nor would it be very readily believed, that the queen was brought to bed of a bird.

If there are ſome few Convulſioniſts yet to be met with in an obſcure corner of the town, it is a kind of louſy diſeaſe that infects only the dregs of the people. Reaſon is every day making her way into the tradeſman's compting-houſe, as well as into the palaces of our nobility. It behoves us then to cultivate the fruits of this reaſon, more eſpecially as it is impoſſible to prevent them from ſprouting forth. France, after having been enlightened by a Paſcal, a Nicole, an Arnaud, a Boſſuet, a Deſcartes, a Gaſſendi, a Bayle, a Fontenelle, and other bright geniuſſes, like them, is no longer to be governed as in the times of Garaſſe and Mênot.

If the maſters of error, I mean the great maſters who were ſo long time prayed to and reverenced for brutalizing the human ſpecies, were at preſent to enjoin us to believe that the ſeed muſt rot in the earth before it can ſprout, that this earth continues immoveable on its baſis, without revolving about the ſun; that the tides are not the natural effect of gravitation; that the rainbow is not formed by the refraction and reflections of the rays of light, &c. and were they to bring certain paſſages of Scripture badly underſtood, and worſe interpreted, to authenticate their ordinances, how would they be looked upon by every perſon of common capacity?

capacity? Would fools be thought too harſh a name to be impoſed upon them? But if they ſhould have recourſe to compulſion and perſecution to eſtabliſh their inſolent ignorance, would not madmen and butchers be deemed proper appellations?

The more that monkiſh ſuperſtition becomes contemptible, the more biſhops are reſpected, and the clergy in general eſteemed. They do good in their profeſſion; whereas the monkiſh ſuperſtition of foreign climates occaſioned a great deal of miſchief. But of all ſuperſtitions, that of hating our neighbour on account of his opinion, is ſurely the moſt dangerous! And will it not be granted me, that there would be more ſenſe and reaſon in adoring the holy navel, the holy prepuce, and the milk, and the robe of the Bleſſed Virgin, than to deteſt and perſecute our brother?

CHAP. XXI.

VIRTUE is better than LEARNING.

THE fewer dogmas, the fewer diſputes; and the fewer diſputes, the fewer calamities: if this is not true, I am much miſtaken.

Religion is inſtituted to make us happy in this life and the next. But what is required to make us happy in the life to come? To be juſt: And in this? To be merciful and forbearing.

It would be the height of madneſs to pretend to bring all mankind to think exactly in the ſame manner in regard to metaphyſics. We might, with much greater eaſe, ſubject the whole univerſe by force of arms, than ſubject the minds of all the inhabitants of one ſingle village.

But Euclid found no difficulty in perſuading every one of the truths of geometry; and why? becauſe there is not one of them which is not a ſelf-evident corollary on this ſimple axiom; "Two and two make four." But it is not altogether the ſame with relation to the complicated maxims in metaphyſics and divinity.

Euſebius

Euſebius and Socrates tell us, that when biſhop Alexander, and Arius the prieſt, began firſt to diſpute in what manner the Logos or word proceeded from the father, the emperor Conſtantine wrote to them in the following terms: "You are great fools to diſpute "about things you do not underſtand."

If the two contending parties had been wiſe enough to acknowledge that the emperor was in the right, Chriſtendom would not have been drenched in blood for upwards of three centuries.

And indeed what can be more ridiculous, or rather deteſtable, than to addreſs mankind in this manner? "My friends, is it not ſufficient that you are faithful "ſubjects, dutiful children, tender parents, and up-"right neighbours; that you live in the continual "practice of virtue; that you are grateful, benevo-"lent, and generous, and worſhip the Saviour of the "world in peace; it is furthermore required of you, "that you ſhould know how a thing may be begotten "from all eternity, without being made from all eter-"nity; and if you cannot diſtinguiſh the homouſion "in the hypoſtaſis, we declare to you that you are "damned to all eternity; and, in the mean time, we "ſhall begin by cutting your throats."

If ſuch a deciſion as this had been preſented to Archimedes, Poſſidonius, Varro, Cato, or Cicero, what anſwer do you think they would have returned to it?

Conſtantine, however, did not perſevere in ſilencing the two parties; he might eaſily have ſent for the chiefs of the diſputes before him, and have demanded of them by what authority they diſturbed the peace of mankind: "Are you, he might have ſaid, poſſeſſed of the ge-"nealogy of the heavenly family? What is it to you "whether the ſon was made or begotten, provided that "you are faithful to him; that you preach a ſound "doctrine, and practiſe that doctrine if you can? I "have committed many faults in my life-time, and ſo "have you: I have been ambitious, ſo have you: it "has coſt me many falſhoods and cruelties to attain to "the empire; I have murdered my neareſt relations "that ſtood in my way; but I now repent, and am "willing to make atonement for my crime by reſtoring

"peace

" peace to the Roman empire; do not you prevent me " from doing the only good action which can poſſibly " make my former cruel ones forgotten; but rather " aſſiſt me to end my days in peace." Perhaps Conſtantine might not, by this ſpeech, have prevailed over the minds of the diſputants, and perhaps he might rather be pleaſed with preſiding in a council in a long crimſon robe, and his forehead glittering with jewels.

This however opened a paſſage to all thoſe dreadful calamities which over-run the Weſt from Aſia. Out of every conteſted verſe there iſſued a fury armed with a quibble and a poniard, who inſpired mankind at once with folly and cruelty. The Huns, the Heruli, the Goths and Vandals, who came afterwards, did infinitely leſs miſchief; and the greateſt they did, was that of afterwards engaging in the ſame fatal diſputes.

CHAP. XXII.

Of UNIVERSAL TOLERATION.

IT does not require any great art or ſtudied elocution, to prove, that Chriſtians ought to tolerate each other. Nay, I ſhall go ſtill farther, and ſay, that we ought to look upon all men as our brethren. How! call a Turk, a Jew, and a Siameſe, my brother? Yes, doubtleſs; for are we not all children of the ſame parent, and the creatures of the ſame creator?

But theſe people hold us in contempt, and call us idolaters! Well then, I ſhould tell them that they were to blame. And I fancy that I could ſtagger the headſtrong pride of an Iman, or a Talapoin, was I to addreſs them in the following manner:

" This little globe, which is no more than a point, " rolls together with many other globes, in that im- " menſity of ſpace in which we are all alike confound- " ed. Man, who is an animal, about five feet high, " is certainly a very inconſiderable part of the crea-

" tion;

" tion; but one of thoſe hardly viſible beings, ſays to
" others of the ſame kind inhabiting another ſpot of
" the globe, hearken to me, for the God of all theſe
" worlds has enlightened me: there are about nine
" hundred millions of us little inſects who inhabit the
" earth, but my ant-hill is alone cheriſhed by God,
" who holds all the reſt in horror and deteſtation;
" thoſe who live with me upon my ſpot will alone be
" happy, and all the reſt eternally wretched."

They would here ſtop me ſhort and aſk, what madman could have made ſo ridiculous a ſpeech? I ſhould then be obliged to anſwer them, It is yourſelves. After which, I ſhould endeavour to pacify them, but perhaps that would not be very eaſy.

I might next addreſs myſelf to the Chriſtians, and venture to ſay, for example, to a Dominican, one of the judges of the inquiſition, " Brother, you know,
" that every province in Italy has a jargon of its own,
" and that they do not ſpeak at Venice and Bergamo
" as they do at Florence. The academy de la Cruſca
" has fixed the ſtandard of the Italian language? its
" dictionary is an unerring rule, and Buon Matei's
" grammar is an infallible guide, from neither of which
" we ought to depart; but do you think that the pre-
" ſident of the academy, or, in his abſence, Buon
" Matei, could in conſcience order the tongues of all
" the Venetians and Bergameſe, who perſiſted in their
" own country dialect, to be cut out?"

The inquiſitor would perhaps make me this reply;
" There is a very wide difference; here the ſalvation
" of your ſoul is concerned; and it is entirely for
" your good that the directory of the inquiſition or-
" dains, that you ſhall be ſeized, upon the depoſition
" of a ſingle perſon, though of the moſt infamous cha-
" racter; that you ſhall have no perſon to plead for
" you, nor even be acquainted with the name of your
" accuſer: that the inquiſitor ſhall promiſe you fa-
" vour, and afterwards condemn you; that he ſhall
" make you undergo five different kinds of torture,
" and that at length you ſhall be either whipt, ſent to
" the

" the gallies, or burnt at the ſtake*; father Ivouet, " and the doctors Chaucalon, Zanchinus, Campegius, " Royas, Felinus Gomarus, Diarbarus, and Gemeli- " nus are exactly of this opinion, conſequently this " pious practice will not admit of contradiction."

To all which I ſhould take the liberty of making the following reply: " Dear brother, you may perhaps be " in the right, and I am perfectly well convinced of " the great benefit you intend me; but may I not be " ſaved without all this?"

It is true, that theſe horrible abſurdities do not every day deform the face of the earth; but they have been very frequent, and one might eaſily collect inſtances enough to make a volume much larger than that of the holy goſpels, which condemns ſuch practices. It is not only very cruel to perſecute in this ſhort life, thoſe who do not think in the ſame manner as we do, but I very much doubt if there is not an impious boldneſs in pronouncing them eternally damned. In my opinion, it little befits ſuch inſects of a ſummer's day, as we are, thus to anticipate the decrees of Providence. I am very far from oppoſing that maxim of the church, that " out of her pale there is no ſalvation:" on the contrary, I reſpect that and every other part of her doctrine; but, after all, can we be ſuppoſed to be intimately acquainted with the ways of God, or to fathom the whole depth of his mercy? Is it not permitted us to hope in him, as well as to fear him? Is it not ſufficient if we are faithful ſons of the church, without every individual preſuming to wreſt the power out of the hand of God, and determine, before him, the future deſtiny of our fellow creatures?

When we wear mourning for a king of England, Denmark, Sweden, or Pruſſia, do we ſay, that we are in mourning for a damned ſoul that is burning in hell? There are about forty millions of inhabitanrs in Europe who are not members of the church of Rome; ſhould we ſay to every one of them, " Sir, as I look upon you

* See that excellent book, intitled, *The Manual of the Inquiſition.*

" to be infallibly damned, I ſhall neither eat, drink,
" converſe, nor have any connections with you?"

Is there an ambaſſador of France, who, when he is preſented to the Grand Seignior for an audience, will ſeriouſly ſay to himſelf, his ſublime highneſs will infallibly burn to all eternity, for having ſubmitted to be circumciſed? If he really thought that the Grand Seignior was a mortal enemy to God, and the object of divine vengeance, could he converſe with ſuch a perſon; nay indeed, ought he to be ſent to him? But how could we carry on any commerce, or perform any of the civil duties of ſociety, if we were convinced that we were converſing with perſons deſtined to eternal damnation?

O ye different worſhippers of a God of mercy! if ye have cruel hearts, if, while you adore that Deity who has placed the whole of his law in theſe few words, " Love God and your neighbour." You have loaded that pure and holy law with ſophiſtical and unintelligible diſputes, if you have lighted the flames of diſcord ſometimes for a new word, and at others for a ſingle letter only; if you have annexed eternal puniſhment to the omiſſion of ſome few words, or of certain ceremonies, which other people cannot comprehend, I muſt ſay to you with tears of compaſſion for mankind: " Tranſport
" yourſelves with me to that great inſtant in which all
" men are to receive judgment from the hand of God,
" who will then do unto every one according to their
" works, and with me behold all the dead of paſt ages
" appearing in his preſence. Are you very ſure that
" our heavenly father and creator will ſay to the wiſe
" and virtuous Confucius, to the great legiſlator So-
" lon, to Pythagoras, Zaleucus, Socrates, Plato, the
" divine Antoninus, the good Trajan, to Titus the de-
" light of human kind, and to many others who have
" been the models of human kind: Depart from me,
" wretches! into torments that know neither alleviation
" nor end; but are, like himſelf, everlaſting. But
" you, my well-beloved ſervants, John Chatel, Ra-
" vaillac, Cartouche, Damiens, &c. who have died
" according to the rules preſcribed by the church, en-

" ter

" ter ye into the joy of your Lord, and ſit for ever " at my right-hand in majeſty and glory?"

Methinks I ſee you ſtart with horror at theſe words; however, as they have eſcaped me, let them paſs; I ſhall ſay nothing more to you.

CHAP. XXIII.

An ADDRESS to the DEITY.

NO longer then do I addreſs myſelf to men, but to thee, God of all beings, of all worlds, and of all ages; if it may be permitted weak creatures, loſt in immenſity, and imperceptible to the reſt of the univerſe, to preſume to petition thee for ought, who haſt given plenty of all things, and whoſe decrees are immutable as eternal. Deign to look with an eye of pity upon the errors annexed to our natures! let not theſe errors prove the ſources of miſery to us! Thou haſt not given us hearts to hate, nor hands to kill each other; grant then that we may mutually aid and aſſiſt each other to ſupport the burthen of this painful and tranſitory life! May the trifling differences in the garments that cover our frail bodies, in the mode of expreſſing our inſignificant thoughts, in our ridiculous cuſtoms, and our imperfect laws, in our idle opinions, and in our ſeveral conditions and ſituations, that appear ſo diſproportionate in our eyes, and all are equal in thine; in a word, may the ſlight variations, that are found amongſt the atoms called men, not be made uſe of by us as ſignals of mutual hatred and perſecution! May thoſe, who worſhip thee by the light of tapers at noon-day, bear charitably with thoſe who content themſelves with the light of that glorious planet thou haſt placed in the midſt of the heavens! May thoſe, who dreſs themſelves in a robe of white linen to teach their hearers that thou art to be loved and feared, not deteſt or revile thoſe who teach the ſame doctrine in long cloaks of black wool! May it be accounted the ſame to adore thee in a dialect formed from an antient or a modern language! May thoſe, who,

cloathed in veſtments of crimſon or violet colour, rule over a little parcel of that heap of dirt called the world, and are poſſeſſed of a few round fragments of a certain metal, enjoy without pride or inſolence what they call grandeur and riches, and may others look on them without envy; for thou knoweſt, O God, that there is nothing in all theſe vanities proper to inſpire envy or pride.

May all men remember that they are brethren! may they alike abhor that tyranny which ſeeks to ſubject the freedom of the will, as they do the rapine which tears from the arms of induſtry the fruits of its peaceful labours! And if the ſcourge of war is not to be avoided, let us not mutually hate and deſtroy each other in the midſt of peace; but rather make uſe of the few moments of our exiſtence to join in praiſing, in a thouſand different languages, from one extremity of the world to the other, thy goodneſs, O all merciful creator, to whom we are indebted for that exiſtence!

CHAP. XXIV.

POSTSCRIPT.

WHILE I was employed in writing this treatiſe, purely with a deſire to make mankind more benevolent and charitable, another author was uſing his pen to the very contrary purpoſe; for every one has his particular way of thinking. This writer has publiſhed a ſmall code of perſecution, under the title of, "The "harmony of religion and humanity:" but this laſt word ſeems to be an error of the preſs, and ſhould be read "Inhumanity."

The author of this holy libel takes St. Auguſtine for his example and authority, who, after having preached up charity and forbearance, afterwards taught the doctrine of perſecution, becauſe he then had the upper hand, and was naturally of a changeable diſpoſition. He alſo quotes Mr. Boſſuet, the biſhop of Meaux, who perſecuted the famous Fenelon archbiſhop of Cambray, whom

whom he accuſed of having ſaid in print, that God was well worthy to be loved for his own ſake.

I will readily grant, that Boſſuet was a very eloquent writer; and it muſt alſo be confeſſed, that the biſhop of Hippo * is frequently inconſiſtent, and in general, more dry and barren than the reſt of the African writers; and I muſt take the liberty of addreſſing them both in the words of Armanda, in Moliere's Learned Ladies, "If we would imitate any perſon, it certainly ſhould "be in the moſt pleaſing part of their character." I ſhould ſay to the biſhop of Hippo: "My lord, as you "have had two opinions, your lordſhip will be kind "enough to ſuffer me to abide by your firſt, ſince I "really think it the beſt."

To the biſhop of Meaux I ſhall ſay, "My lord, you "are certainly a very great man, and, in my opinion, "have to the full as much learning as St. Auguſtine, "and are far ſuperior to him in eloquence; but then, "my lord, why did you ſo diſtreſs your brother pre-"late, who had as much eloquence as yourſelf, though "in another kind, and whoſe diſpoſition was more "amiable than yours?"

The author of this Treatiſe on Inhumanity, (for ſo I ſhall call it) is neither a Boſſuet, nor an Auguſtine; but ſeems admirably well qualified for an inquiſitor; I wiſh he was at the head of that noble tribunal at Goa. Beſides, he is a politician, and parades it in his book with ſeveral great maxims of ſtate. "If you have to deal "with any conſiderable number of heretics," ſays he "it will be neceſſary to uſe gentle methods, and try to "bring them over by perſuaſion; but if they are only "a few in number, then make free uſe of the gibbet "and the galleys, you will find the advantage of it." This is the good prelate's own advice, in the 89th and 90th pages of his work.

Heaven be praiſed, I am an orthodox catholic, and, therefore, am in no danger of what the Hugonots call

* Now Bona, a town of Conſtantia in Africa. St. Auguſtin was biſhop of this ſee above forty years. It now belongs to Algiers.

martyrdom: but if ever this biſhop ſhould come to be prime-miniſter, as he ſeems to flatter himſelf in his libels, I give him my promiſe, that I will ſet out for England the very day his commiſſion is ſigned.

In the mean time, we ought to be thankful to Providence, that thoſe of his principles are always wretched reaſoners. This writer has not ſcrupled to quote Bayle among the advocates for non-toleration; which is being equally ſenſible and honeſt; for, becauſe Bayle agrees, that it is neceſſary to puniſh incendiaries and rogues, our biſhop directly concludes, that we ought to perſecute with fire and ſword every honeſt and peaceable perſon. See page 98.

Almoſt the whole of his book is no other than a copy of the apology for St. Bartholomew's-day. It is the apologiſt himſelf or his echo. But be this matter as it will, it is devoutly to be wiſhed, that neither the maſter nor the pupil may ever be at the head of an adminiſtration.

But if ever ſuch a thing ſhould come to paſs, let me beg leave to preſent them beforehand with the following hint, in regard to a paſſage in the ninety-third page of the biſhop's holy libel.

"Is the welfare of the whole nation to be ſacrificed "to the eaſe of only the twentieth part?"

Let us ſuppoſe then for once, that there are twenty Roman Catholics in France to one Hugonot, I am by no means for the Hugonots eating theſe twenty Catholics; but, at the ſame time, is there any reaſon why the twenty Catholics ſhould eat the Hugonots? Beſides, why ſhould we hinder this latter from marrying? Are there not many biſhops, abbots, and monks, that have eſtates in Dauphiny, Gevaudan, Agde, and Carcaſſonne? And have not moſt of theſe farmers to manage thoſe eſtates, who do not believe in the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation? Is it not the intereſt of theſe biſhops, &c. that the farmers ſhould have numerous families? And ſhould one be permitted to have children that takes the ſacrament in both kinds? Surely, there is neither juſtice nor common honeſty in this!

"The

"The revocation of the Edict of Nantes," says my author, "has not been productive of so great inconveniencies as has been generally alledged."

I must own if any have added to the number of bad effects that act produced, they must have greatly exaggerated; but then it is the common fault of all historians to exaggerate, as it is of all controversial writers to disguise the greatest part of those evils with which they are reproachable. But for once, let us neither pin our faith upon the doctors of the Sorbonne, nor the preachers of Amsterdam. Let us take for judges in this matter those who have had the best opportunities of being acquainted with what they wrote upon; and in the first place, I shall cite the count d'Avaux, ambassador from France to the States-General, during the years 1685, 1686, 1687, and 1688.

In the hundred and eighty-first page of the fifth volume of his works, he says that one man only offered to discover upwards of twenty millions of livres, that the persecuted Hugonots had found means to send out of France. Lewis XIV. in answer to this, writes to Mr. d'Avaux, "The accounts which I daily receive of the "prodigious numbers of those who are converted, convince me, that in a short time the most obstinate will "follow the example of the others."

This letter of the king's plainly shews that he was firmly persuaded of the greatness of his power. He was accustomed to hear said to him every morning, Sire, you are the greatest monarch upon earth; you have but to declare your opinion, and the whole world will be proud to follow it. Pelisson, who had accumulated a prodigious fortune in the place of head-clerk of the treasury, who had been three years confined in the Bastile as an accomplice with Fouquet, who, changing his religion, was from a Calvinist made a Roman, a deacon, and a beneficed priest, who composed hymns for the mass and verses to Chloe, and who had got the post of comptroller and converter in chief of the heretics; this very Pelisson, I say, used to produce every morning a long list of pretended abjurations purchased at the rate of seven or eight crowns a-piece; and made his

prince believe, that he could, whenever he pleaſed, convert the whole Mahometan empire at the ſame price. In ſhort, every one was in league to impoſe upon him: how then was it poſſible for him to avoid being deceived?

This very M. d'Avaux alſo acquaints the court that one Vincent kept upwards of five hundred workmen employed in the neighbourhood of Angoulême, and that it would be of great prejudice to the nation ſhould they quit the kingdom. Tom. v. page 194.

The count likewiſe mentions two regiments at that time actually raiſing by French refugee officers for the ſervice of the prince of Orange: he obſerves that the entire crews of three French ſhips of war had deſerted and entered into the ſame ſervice; and that beſides the two regiments above-mentioned, the prince was forming a company of cadet refugees, who were to be commanded by two refugee captains. Page 240. The ſame ambaſſador in another letter to Mr. de Segnelay, dated the 9th of May, 1686, ſays, "That he can no "longer conceal the uneaſineſs it gives him to ſee the "manufactures of France tranſported into Holland, "where they will be eſtabliſhed, never more to re-"turn."

Add to theſe inconteſtable evidences the teſtimonies of the ſeveral intendants of the kingdom in 1698, and then let any one judge whether the revocation of the edict of Nantes has not done more harm than good, notwithſtanding the opinion of the worthy author of the "Harmony of Religion and Inhumanity."

A marſhal of France well known for his ſuperior abilities, ſome few years ago made uſe of the following expreſſion, "I know not whether the practice of dra-"gooning may ever have been neceſſary, but I am ſure "it is very neceſſary to lay it aſide."

And here I muſt confeſs, that I was apprehenſive I had gone rather too far, in publiſhing the letter from a prieſt to father Le Tellier, in which the uſe of gunpowder is ſo humanely propoſed. I ſaid to myſelf, people will not believe me; they will certainly think this letter is a forged piece: but luckily my ſcruples were entirely

entirely eaſed, when in peruſing the "Harmony of "Religion and Inhumanity," I came to the following Chriſtian and charitable paſſage.

"The entire extirpation of the proteſtants in France, "would not weaken that kingdom more than a plenti- "ful bleeding would a patient of a ſound conſtituti- "on." Page 149.

Here this pious miniſter of Chriſt, who, but a few pages before, ſays, That the proteſtants make about a twentieth part of the nation, is for ſhedding the blood of that twentieth part, and adviſes the operation with as much unconcern as he would the taking away two or three ounces from the arm of a plethoric perſon! Heaven preſerve us and him from the other three twentieths!

Now if this worthy prelate is for deſtroying the twentieth part of the nation at one ſtroke, might not father Le Tellier's friend and correſpondent as well have propoſed the blowing up, ſtabbing, or poiſoning the one third? Hence then it appears very probable, that ſuch a letter was really wrote to Tellier.

Our pious author concludes upon the whole, that perſecution is an excellent thing. "For," ſays he, "we "do not find it abſolutely condemned by our Saviour." Neither has our Saviour expreſsly condemned thoſe who may ſet fire to the four corners of Paris! but is that a reaſon for canonizing all incendiaries?

In this manner, while the gentle voice of nature is every where pleading the cauſe of charity and benevolence, Enthuſiaſm, her avowed enemy, is continually howling againſt it; and while Peace opens her calm boſom to all mankind, Perſecution is buſied in forging weapons for their deſtruction. Let it be your care then, O ye princely arbiters, who have reſtored peace to the world, to paſs ſentence between the ſpirit of mutual love and harmony and that of diſcord and bloodſhed.

CHAP. XXV.

SEQUEL and CONCLUSION.

ON the 7th of March, 1763, a council of ſtate being held at Verſailles, at which all the great miniſters aſſiſted, and the chancellor ſat as preſident, Mr. de Croſne, one of the maſters of requeſts, made a report of the affair of the Calas family with all the impartiality of a judge, and the preciſion of one perfectly well acquainted with the caſe; and with the plain truth and inſpired eloquence of an orator and a ſtateſman, which is alone ſuitable to ſuch an aſſembly. The gallery was filled with a prodigious number of perſons of all ranks, who impatiently waited the deciſion of the council. In a ſhort time a deputation was ſent to the king, to acquaint him that the council had come to an unanimous reſolution, That the parliament of Thouloufe ſhould tranſmit to them the whole account of its proceedings, together with the reaſons on which it had framed the ſentence condemning John Calas to be broken on the wheel; when his majeſty was pleaſed to concur in the decree of the council.

Juſtice and humanity then ſtill continue to reſide amongſt mankind; and principally in the council of a king beloved, and deſerving ſo to be; who, with his miniſters, his chancellor, and all the members of his council, have not diſdained to employ their time in weighing all the circumſtances relating to the ſufferings of a private family with as much attention as if it had been the moſt intereſting affair of war or peace; whilſt the judges have ſhewn themſelves inſpired by a love of equity, and a tender regard to the intereſts of their fellow ſubjects. All praiſe be given therefore to that merciful Being, the only giver of integrity and every other virtue!

And here we take occaſion to declare, that we never had the leaſt acquaintance with the unfortunate man who was condemned on the moſt frivolous evidence by the court of juſtice of Thouloufe, in direct contradiction

to

to the ordinances of our king, and the laws of all nations; nor with his ſon Mark Anthony, the extraordinary manner of whoſe death led the judges into the error they committed; nor with the mother, whoſe ſufferings call aloud for compaſſion; nor yet with her innocent daughter, who, together with her travelled upwards of ſix hundred miles to lay their virtue and diſtreſſes at the foot of the throne.

The God in whoſe preſence we declare this, knows that we have been actuated ſolely by the love of juſtice, mercy, and truth, in delivering our thoughts in the manner we have done on toleration, in regard to John Calas, who fell a victim to non-toleration and perſecution.

We had not the leaſt intent to offend the eight judges of Thouloufe, in ſaying that they were miſtaken, as the council of ſtate itſelf ſuppoſes them to have been: on the contrary, we have opened a way for them to vindicate themſelves to all Europe, by acknowledging that equivocal circumſtances, and the clamour of an headſtrong and enraged populace, had biaſſed their judgment; and by aſking pardon of the widow, and repairing, as much as in them lies, the ruin they have brought upon an innocent family, by adding to the number of thoſe who ſuccour them in their affliction. They have put the father to death unjuſtly, let them then be as fathers to his children, provided thoſe children are willing to accept of this poor token of repentance from them. It would be infinitely to the honour of the judges to make ſuch an offer, and to that of the injured family to refuſe it.

But it principally behoves the ſieur David, capitoul of Tholouſe, to ſet the example of remorſe and penitence, who was the firſt to raiſe this perſecution againſt innocence, and who inſulted the hapleſs father of a family when expiring on the ſcaffold. This was indeed an unparalleled act of cruelty; but as God is willing to ſhew mercy and forgiveneſs, it is the duty of mortals to pardon in like manner thoſe who make atonement for their offences.

Having

Having received a letter from a friend in Languedoc, dated the 20th of February, 1763, of whch the following is an extract,

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

" Your treatiſe on toleration appears to be full of " humanity and truth; but I am afraid it will rather " hurt than ſerve the Calas family. It may gall the " eight judges who were for the ſentence, and they " may apply to the parliament to have your book burnt " beſides, the bigots, of which you are ſenſible there " is always a conſiderable number, will oppoſe the " the voice of reaſon with the clamours of prejudice, " &c."

My anſwer was as follows:

" The eight judges of Thouloufe may, if they pleaſe, " have my book burnt. It will coſt them very little " trouble, ſince the *Provincial Letters*, which had in- " infinitely ſuperior merit to any thing of mine, were " condemned to the ſame fate. Every one, you know, " is at liberty to burn in his own houſe ſuch books as " he does not like.

" My treatiſe cannot poſſibly do either hurt or good " to the Calas family, with whom I have not the leaſt " acquaintance. The king's council is no leſs reſolute " than impartial: it judges according to law and equity " of thoſe things which fall properly under its cogni- " zance; but it will not interfere with a common pam- " phlet, written upon a ſubject altogether foreign from " the affair under conſideration.

" If an hundred volumes in folio ſhould be written in " condemnation or vindication of the judges of Thou- " louſe, or of toleration, neither the council, nor any " other court of juſtice would look upon theſe as law " matters.

" I readily agree with you that there are numbers of " enthuſiaſts who will ſet up the cry againſt me, but " at the ſame time I do inſiſt, that I ſhall have as " many ſenſible readers who make uſe of their rea- " ſon.

" I hear

" I hear that the parliament of Thoulouſe and ſome " other courts of juſtice have a method of proceeding " peculiar to themſelves. They admit fourths, thirds, " and ſixths of a proof: ſo that with ſix hear-ſays on " one ſide, three on the other, and four-fourths of " preſumption, they frame three complete proofs; and " and in conſequence of this curious demonſtration, " will condemn you a man to be broke upon the wheel " without mercy. Now the leaſt acquaintance with " the art of logic or reaſoning would point out a diffe- " rent method of proceeding to them. What we call " an half proof can never amount to more than a ſuſ- " picion: but there is no ſuch thing in reality as an " half-proof; for a thing muſt either be proved or not " proved: there is no medium.

" A million of ſuſpicions put together can no more " frame a regular proof, than a million of cyphers can " compoſe an arithmetical number.

" There are fourths of tones or ſounds in muſic, " and theſe are to be expreſſed; put there are no " fourths in truth, nor in reaſoning.

" Two witneſſes agreeing in the ſame depoſition, " are eſteemed to make a proof; but this is not enough: " theſe two witneſſes ſhould be clear of all paſſion and " prejudice, and, above all, their teſtimony ſhould be " in every part conſonant with reaſon.

" Suppoſe four perſons, of the moſt reſpectable ap- " pearance, were to come and ſwear in a court of juſ- " tice that they ſaw an infirm old man take a vigorous " young fellow, by the collar, and toſs him out of a " window, to the diſtance of ſix or ſeven feet; cer- " tainly ſuch deponents ought to be ſent to a mad- " houſe.

" But the eight judges of Thoulouſe condemned " John Calas upon a much more improbable accuſation; " for there was no one appeared to ſwear that he had " actually ſeen this feeble old man of ſeventy ſeize a ſtout " young fellow of twenty-eight, and hang him up. " Indeed certain enthuſiaſtic wretches ſaid, that they " had been told by other enthuſiaſts like themſelves, " that they had been told by ſome of their own ſect,

" that

" that they had heard that John Calas had by a ſuper-
" natural ſtrength overcome his ſon and hanged him.
" And thus was the moſt abſurd of all ſentences paſſed
" upon the moſt abſurd of all evidence.

" In fine, there is no remedy againſt ſuch kind of
" proceedings, but that thoſe, who purchaſe their ſeats
" in a court of juſtice, ſhould, for the future, be oblig-
" ed to ſtudy a little better."

This treatiſe on toleration is a petition which humanity with all ſubmiſſion preſents to power and prudence, I have ſowed a grain that may perhaps produce a rich harveſt. We may hope every thing from time, from the goodneſs of the heart of our gracious monarch the wiſdom of his miniſters, and the ſpirit of ſound reaſon, which begins to diffuſe its ſalutary influence over all minds.

Nature addreſſes herſelf thus to mankind: " I have
" formed you all weak and ignorant, to vegetate a few
" moments on that earth, which you are afterwards to
" fatten with your carcaſes. Let your weakneſs then
" teach you to ſuccour each other; and as you are ig-
" norant, bear with, and endeavour mutually to inſtruct
" each other. Even if ye were all of the ſame way of
" thinking, which certainly will never come to paſs,
" and there ſhould be one ſingle perſon only found
" amongſt you who differed from you in belief, you
" ought to forgive him; for it is I who make him think
" in the manner he does. I have given you hands to
" cultivate the earth, and a faint glimmering of reaſon
" to conduct yourſelves by; and I have planted in your
" hearts a ſpirit of compaſſion, that you may aſſiſt each
" other under the burthen of life. Do not ſmother
" that ſpark, not ſuffer it to be corrupted; for know,
" it is of divine origin: neither ſubſtitute the wretched
" debates of the ſchools in the place of the voice of
" nature.

" It is I alone who unite you all, in deſpite of your-
" ſelves, by your mutual wants, even in the midſt of
" thoſe bloody wars that you undertake for the ſlighteſt
" cauſes, and that afford a continual ſcene of error,
" chances, and misfortunes: It is I alone, who, in a
" nation

" nation, prevent the fatal effects of the inextinguiſha-
" ble differences that ſubſiſt between the ſword and the
" law, between thoſe two profeſſions and the clergy,
" and between even the citizen and the huſbandman.
" Tho' ignorant of the limits of their own prerogatives,
" they are in deſpite of themſelves obliged to liſten to
" my voice, which ſpeaks to their hearts. It is I alone
" who maintain equity in the courts of judicature,
" where otherwiſe every thing would he determined by
" error and caprice, in the midſt of a confuſed heap
" of laws, framed too often at a venture, and to
" ſupply an immediate call, differing from each other
" in every province and town, and almoſt always con-
" tradictory in the ſame place. I alone can inſpire the
" love and knowledge of juſtice, while the laws inſpire
" only chicanery and ſubterfuge. He who liſtens to
" me ſeldom forms a wrong judgment; while he, who
" ſeeks only to reconcile contradictory opinions, loſes
" himſelf in the fruitleſs labour.

" There is an immenſe edifice whoſe foundation I
" laid with my own hands. It was at once ſolid and
" ſimple; all mankind might have entered into it with
" ſafety; but they, in ſeeking to ornament, overloaded
" it with uſeleſs and fantaſtic decorations. The build-
" ing is continually falling to decay, and they gather
" up the ſtones to throw at one another; while I am
" inceſſantly calling out to them, Hold, madmen!
" clear away the ruins with which you are ſurrounded,
" and which you yourſelves have made; come and live
" with me in uninterrupted tranquillity within my man-
" ſion, that is not to be ſhaken."

MISCELLANIES

IN

HISTORY, LITERATURE, AND PHILOSOPHY.

MISCELLANIES

IN

HISTORY, LITERATURE, AND PHILOSOPHY.

OF CEREMONIES.

THE arm-chair, the eaſy-chair, the court-ſtool, the right and the left hand, have, for ſeveral ages, been conſidered as important objects of policy, and illuſtrious ſubjects for diſputes. I fancy that the ancient ceremonial relating to arm-chairs, took its riſe from our barbarous anceſtors having but one of theſe chairs at moſt in a houſe, and that this was commonly appropriated to the uſe of any perſon who was ſick. There are ſtill ſeveral provinces in France, and counties in England, where the arm-chair is called a groaning-chair.

Long after the times of Attila and Dagobert, when luxury began to creep into courts, and that the great ones of the earth had two or three arm-chairs in their mighty dungeons, it was eſteemed a ſingular mark of diſtinction to ſit on one of theſe thrones; and the maſter of a caſtle took care to have preſerved among the records of his family, that having been to pay his court

court to ſuch a count, he had been received by him in an arm-chair.

We may read in the Memoirs of Mademoiſelle, ſiſter to Lewis XIV. that this auguſt princeſs paſſed at leaſt a fourth part of her life in mortal agonies, occaſioned by diſputes about eaſy chairs; and a whole court was taken up in caballing whether it was proper to ſit on a chair or a ſtool in ſuch or ſuch a room, or whether to ſit at all. At preſent our manners are more uniform, and ladies make uſe indifferently of couches or ſophas without the peace of ſociety being diſturbed.

When cardinal Richelieu was negotiating the marriage between Henrietta of France and Charles I. of England, with the ambaſſador of that nation, the affair was on the point of being broken off, on account of two or three ſteps nearer to a door that was claimed by the ambaſſador, till the Cardinal, to get over the mighty difficulty, received him in bed; and this precious anecdote has been carefully preſerved in hiſtory. I am of opinion, that, if it had been propoſed to Scipio to place himſelf at his length naked between two ſheets to receive Hannibal's viſit, he would have thought it a droll ceremony.

One coach going before another, and what is called taking the way in a ſtreet or road, has alſo been a mark of grandeur, and occaſioned claims, diſputes, and petty combats, for a whole century together; and it was eſteemed a ſignal victory for the equipage of one perſon to oblige that of another to yield the way. When foreign ambaſſadors paſſed through a ſtreet, it was like diſputing the prize in a circus; and if a Spaniſh miniſter made a Portugueſe coachman back his horſes, he immediately diſpatched a courier poſt-haſte to Madrid, to inform the king his maſter of the advantage he had gained.

In proportion as a nation is more or leſs barbarous, or the court weak or powerful, theſe ceremonies are more or leſs in vogue. True power and real politeneſs deſpiſe oſtentation.

It is probable that we ſhall one time or other ſee an end to the ridiculous cuſtom which ſtill prevails among the

ambaſſadors of ſome courts, to beggar themſelves the ſake of going in proceſſion through the ſtreets ith a number of hired coaches, vamped up and new lt, and preceded by a croud of ſervants walking on ot. This is called making their entry; and it is plea- nt enough to hear of a perſon making his entry into city ſeven or eight months after his arrival.

The important affair of the *punctilio*, which conſti- tes the grandeur of the modern Romans; the theory the number of paces to be made in conducting a fig- r to the door at his departure; of opening a curtain lf way, or alltogether; of taking the right or left nd of a perſon in a room; this noble art, I ſay, hich would never have entered the heads of a Fabius a Cato, begins now to give way; and the train- arers to the cardinals lament, with tears in their eyes, at every thing ſeems to denounce a general lapſe of eſe eſſential ceremonials.

A French colonel happening to be at Bruſſels about year ago, and not knowing how to ſpend his time, ropoſed going to the public aſſembly; one of his ac- uaintance told him it was held at the houſe of a prin- eſs. With all my heart, replied the officer; but what that? Why princes go there. Are you a prince? iſh, man! ſaid he, they are very good kind of rinces: laſt year, when we took the town, I had a ozen of them waiting in my anti-chamber; they are e civileſt creatures breathing.

FOLLY

FOLLY ON BOTH SIDES.

FOLLY on both Sides is the true device of all diſputants and their diſputes. I do not ſpeak here of thoſe that have occaſioned bloodſhed. The ruin and devaſtation ſpread through all Weſtphalia by the Anabaptiſts; the wars excited in France by the Calviniſts; the bloody factions of the Armagnacs * and the Burgundians; the puniſhment of the Maid of Orleans, whom one half of France revered as an heroine ſent from heaven, and the other half deteſted as a vile ſorcereſs; the petition of the Sorbonne to have her committed to the flames; the aſſaſſination of the duke of Orleans juſtified by the divines; a decree of the Sacred Faculty releaſing ſubjects from their oath of allegiance; the employing of executioners to maintain tenets and opinions; the kindling of fires to burn unhappy wretches who were perſuaded to own themſelves magicians or heretics; all this ſurpaſſed folly: and here, by the way, let it be obſerved, that ſuch execrable doings were the growth of the age of purity, and the effects of Germanic good faith and Gaulic ſimplicity: to which I refer thoſe honeſt people who are perpetually regretting paſt times.

And here I propoſe, purely for my own edification, to draw up a ſhort memorandum of the curious matters that employed the attention and divided the opinions of our anceſtors.

In the eleventh century, that good time when we knew nothing of the art of war, though we were continually fighting, and were equally ignorant of police, trade, and the rules of ſociety; when we knew neither how to read or write; people of great parts engaged

* The factions of Armagnac and Burgundy diſtinguiſhed the unfortunate reign of Charles VI. of France, and contributed, in a great meaſure, to the ſucceſs of the Engliſh in conquering the kingdom.

gaged in ſolemn, long, and even ſharp diſputes, concerning what paſſed in the privy cloſet at the performing a certain office, which decency requires to be ſpoken of with the greateſt reſerve. This was called the diſpute of the Stercoriſts*; a diſpute which did not excite a war indeed, and was therefore, on that account, the moſt ſufferable of all the follies of the human mind.

The diſpute about the Moſarabic verſion, which engaged the attention of the learned kingdom of Spain in the ſame century, terminated likewiſe without occaſioning the deſolation of provinces, or the effuſion of blood. The ſpirit of chivalry, which reigned at that time, permitted no other method of clearing up this controverſy, but by referring it to the deciſion of two noble knights; and he of the two Don Quixotes who firſt threw his adverſary to the ground, was to eſtabliſh that verſion of which be was the champion. Don Ruis de Martanza, knight of the Moſarabic ritual, unhorſed the Don Quixote of the Latin ritual; but as the laws of noble chivalry did not poſitively determine that a ritual was to be proſcribed, becauſe its knight was unhorſed, they had recourſe to a more certain expedient (and which was then greatly in vogue) to determine which of the two books was to have the preference; and this was by throwing them both into the fire, when there was no doubt that the true ritual † would come out unhurt. But, I know not by what accident, they were both conſumed, and the diſpute remained undecided, to the great aſtoniſhment of the pious and learned Spaniards. By degrees the Latin ritual prevailed; and, if any knight had afterwards offered himſelf to defend

* The ſect of Stercoriſts were thoſe who maintained, that part of the ſacramental bread, when ſwallowed, was digeſted and converted to ordure.

† It was in the papacy of Gregory VII. that the Roman ſervice or Latin ritual was eſtabliſhed in Leon and Caſtile, by the intrigues of Cardinal Hugo, furnamed the White, even after the preceding pope Alexander II. had declared, that the old Gothic liturgies were perfectly orthodox.

defend the Moſarabic cauſe, the knight, and not the ritual, would have been thrown into the fire.

In theſe glorious times, we civilized people, when we were taken ill, were obliged to have recourſe to an Arabian phyſician; and, if we wanted to know the age of the moon, we muſt apply to the Arabians; if we had occaſion for a piece of cloth, it was to be purchaſed of a Jew; and when a huſbandman wanted rain, he addreſſed himſelf to a conjurer. But when, in proceſs of time, we had learned Latin, and had gotten a miſerable tranſlation of Ariſtotle, we began to make a figure in the world, and for three or four hundred years employed ourſelves in explaining a few pages of the Stagyrite, in worſhipping them, and condemning them. Some have aſſerted, that but for him we had been deſtitute of the articles of faith; and others again as poſitively maintained that he was an Atheiſt. A Spaniard undertook to prove that Ariſtotle was a ſaint, and his nativity ought to be kept as a feſtival; a council in France condemned his divine writings to the flames; whole colleges, univerſities, and religious orders, have reciprocally anathematized each other on account of certain paſſages in this great man, which neither themſelves, the judges who interpoſed their authority, nor the author himſelf, underſtood. Many fiſty-cuffs were dealt on each ſide in Germany in conſequence of thoſe weighty diſputes; but very little or no blood was ſhed. It is a little unlucky for Ariſtotle's fame that there was no civil war raiſed, nor any pitched battle fought, in favour of the *Quiddities*, and *the Whole of the Part of the Thing*. Our anceſtors have cut each other's throats for controverſies of as little ſignification.

It is true, indeed, that a very famous madman called Occam *, and ſurnamed the *Invincible Doctor*, the chief of thoſe who maintained *the Whole of a Part of the Thought*,

* William Occam, a native of England, was a Cordelier, who lived in the fourteenth century, and had been a diſciple of Scot, whoſe doctrines he afterwards oppoſed. He was ſurnamed the *Invincible Doctor*, the *Singular Doctor*, and the *Venerable Preceptor*. He eſpouſed the cauſe of Lewis of Bavaria, the declared

Thought, desired the emperor, Lewis of Bavaria, to draw the sword of the empire in defence of his writings against one Scot, or *Scotus*, another madman, surnamed the *Subtile Doctor*, who stickled for *the Whole of the Part of the Thing*. Happily Lewis of Bavaria kept his sword in its scabbard. Who would imagine that these idle disputes should have continued even down to these later ages; and that the parliament of Paris, in 1614, issued a curious decree in favour of Aristotle?

Much about the time of the doughty Occam and his intrepid rival Scot, there arose a dispute of a more serious nature, in which the reverend fathers Cordeliers found means to engage the whole Christian world; namely, whether they had a right to the porridge * they eat, or were to be considered only as usufructuaries. The form of the cowl and the depth of the sleeve were also subjects of this holy war. Pope John XXII. having interfered in these disputes, was soon made to know whom he had to deal with. The Cordeliers quitted him to side with Lewis of Bavaria, who then unsheathed his sword. At that time three or four of these reverend disputants were burnt as heretics. This was carrying the jest rather too far; but, however, as this affair neither overturned thrones nor ruined whole states, it may be ranked in the number of peaceable follies.

There

declared enemy of the church of Rome; and used to say to that prince, "Defend me with your sword, and I will support you "with my pen." He was accused of having taught, that neither Christ nor his apostles had any possession, either in particular or in common. He wrote several tracts against the church of Rome, for which he was excommunicated; and the Protestants sometimes made use of his writings in their dispute with the papal see.

* The regulations of the Cordeliers not permitting them to have any possession of their own, pope Nicholas III. who had been of their order, resolved to enrich them without hurting their delicacy. With this view, he put them in possession of great estates, at the same time ordaining, that they should only have the use of those estates; but that the property of them should be vested in the church. This bull, however, was repealed by pope John XXII.

There has never been a want of theſe; but moſt of them have ſunk in ſilent oblivion; and of four or five hundred ſects that have, at different times, made their appearance, mankind retain the remembrance of ſuch only which have produced either exceſſive diſorders or exceſſive abſurdities; two things which are eaſily remembered. Who recollects at preſent that there were Orebites, Oſmites, or Inſdorfians? or knows any thing of the Cornacians or the Iſcariotiſts?

One day, that I dined with a Dutch lady, I was charitably cautioned by one of the company to take care how I acted, and not to ſpeak in commendation of Voetius*. And pray why this caution? ſaid I. Becauſe, ſaid my friendly adviſer, the lady of the houſe is a Cocceian; adding, that there were ſtill four of that ſect in Holland, and that it would be a great unhappineſs the race ſhould be extinct. A time will come, when the Janſeniſts, who have made ſo much noiſe amongſt us, and who are now hardly known, will ſhare the ſame fate with the Cocceians. An old doctor ſaid to me one day, Sir, in my younger days, I was a warm ſtickler for the *mandata impoſſibilia volentibus et conantibus*; I wrote againſt the formulary and the pope, and imagined myſelf a confeſſor; I was thrown into priſon, and looked upon myſelf as a martyr. At preſent I meddle with nothing, and think myſelf reaſonable. How

* Geſbert Voet was, in the laſt century, a celebrated profeſſor of theology in the univerſity of Utrecht. He aſſiſted at the ſynod of Dordrecht, and from that time became a zealous defender of Calvin's doctrines. He wrote virulently againſt Des Cartes, John Coccius, and Samuel Deſmarets, which laſt did not fail to retort his abuſe. John Henry Cocceius, or Cock, was a native of Bremen, and made ſuch great progreſs in the Greek tongue, and in theology, that he was choſen profeſſor of both at Francker, and afterwards removed to Leyden. He compiled a Hebrew dictionary, and wrote commentaries upon the Old Teſtament, which are tedious, diffuſed, and chimerical. He pretends to have diſcovered many myſtical meanings in the Scripture, which had eſcaped all former critics, and was indeed a viſionary and enthuſiaſt. Voetius and Deſmarets called him an Innovator and Scriptuarian; and, in a word, he was but ſcurvily treated by his Proteſtant brethren.

How do you employ yourſelf now? ſaid I. Sir, replied he, I am very fond of money. In this manner do the greateſt part of mankind, when they come to be old, laugh within themſelves at the follies that they eagerly ran after in their youth. Sects grow old, like men. Thoſe which have not been ſupported by powerful princes, nor been the cauſe of great calamities grow old ſooner than others. They are epidemic diſorders, which paſs off like the ſweating ſickneſs, or the hooping cough.

We no longer hear of the pious reveries of a Madame Guion; we no longer read the unintelligible jargon of the *Maxims of Saints*, but in its room Telemachus; we remember not the writings of the eloquent Boſſuet againſt the ſoft, the elegant, the charming Fenelon, and only give the preference to his funeral orations. The whole of the controverſy about what was called *Quietiſm*, was nothing but the ſecond edition of the old ſtory of the good woman who carried a chafing-diſh of coals to ſet fire to heaven, and a pitcher of water to extinguiſh hell, that mankind might, for the future, ſerve God neither through fear nor hope. I ſhall only obſerve one ſingular circumſtance in this affair, that fell ſhort of the ſtory of the good woman, which is, that the Jeſuits, who were ſo violently accuſed by the Janſeniſts as a body inſtituted by St. Ignatius on purpoſe to deſtroy the love of God, ſolicited the court of Rome in favour of the archbiſhop of Cambray's favourite tenet of true love. The ſame thing happened to him as did to Mr. de Langeais, who had an action brought againſt him in the parliament of Paris, by his wife, for impotency, and another in that of Rennes by a young girl, for having got her with child. One would think he muſt have been cleared upon one or other of the two indictments, and yet he was caſt in both. The doctrine of pure love, for which the Jeſuits beſtirred themſelves ſo violently, was condemned at Rome, and they themſelves paſſed with all Paris for perſons who wanted to aboliſh the love of God. This opinion was ſo rooted in all minds, that ſome years ago, when they publiſhed for ſale a copper-plate repreſent-

ing our Saviour in the dreſs of a Jeſuit, an arch wag (undoubtedly the *Louiſtik* of the Janſeniſt party) wrote theſe lines underneath:

Admirez l'artifice extrême
De ces peres ingénieux ;
Ils vons ont habillé comme eux,
Mon Dieu, de peur qu' on ne vous aime.

"How admirable is the artifice of theſe ingenious "Fathers! They have dreſſed our God like them-"ſelves, for fear we ſhould be tempted to love him."

At Rome, which is never perplexed with diſputes of this kind, and to whoſe tribunal all thoſe of other places are referred, they ſoon began to grow weary of the controverſies about pure love. Cardinal Carpegne, who was one of the council in the archbiſhop of Cambray's affair, happened to be afflicted with a grievous diſorder in a certain part that is not more exempt from pains and maladies in a cardinal than in thoſe of a leſs ſacred character. His ſurgeon one day dreſſing him with ſome tents made of a fine cloth they call *Cambray** in Italy, as well as in many other parts, and putting him to ſome pain, his eminence roared out. Sure, ſaid the ſurgeon, it cannot hurt your eminency; it is ſoft Cambray. How! replied the cardinal, is Cambray got there too? Is it not enough that he has already turned my head? Happy the controverſies that end in this manner; happy for mankind if all the diſputants and arch-heretics in the univerſe had ſubmitted with the ſame moderation and magnanimous compliance as the great archbiſhop of Cambray, who, of all mankind, had the leaſt inclination to be the leader of an hereſy. I know not whether he was right in wanting us to love God purely for his own ſake; but I am certain this amiable prelate highly merited to be loved in that manner.

In

* What we call cambrick. The difference of the termination in Engliſh will not allow us to preſerve the whole force of the play in the word that is in the French.

In controverſies that are merely literary, there is often as much rancour and party ſpirit as in diſputes of the moſt intereſting nature to mankind. If it was poſſible, we ſhould ſee the factions of the circus revived amongſt us, that for ſo long a time diſtracted the Roman empire. Two rival actreſſes are capable of ſetting a whole city by the ears. Mankind have in general a ſecret diſpoſition to faction and party; and if they cannot cabal againſt, perſecute, or deſtroy each other, for crowns, tiaras, or mitres, they will fall out about a fidler or a dancer. Rameau has had a violent party againſt him, who did all in their power to ruin him; but he knew nothing of it. I myſelf have had a party ſtill more violent againſt me, and I was very ſenſible of it.

MEMNON;

OR,

HUMAN WISDOM.

ONE day Memnon formed the mad project to be perfectly wise. Few men have not, at one time or other, been infected with this folly. Memnon argued thus with himself: To be very wise, and consequently very happy, nothing more is necessary than to divest one's self of the passions, and every one knows this is easily done. In the first place, I will never love any woman; for, when I behold a perfect beauty, I will say to myself, Those blooming cheeks will one day be furrowed with wrinkles; those lively eyes sore and red with galling rheum; those swelling breasts, whose roundness is now so inviting to the touch, will become lank and shrivelled; those charming tresses grey and few in number; therefore I have nothing more to do than to look upon these charms now with the same eyes as I should then, and assuredly they can never cause me any emotions.

In the second place, I will be always sober. If at any time I am tempted by excellent cheer, delicious wines, or the charms of society, I shall have only to represent to myself the consequences of a debauch; such as an aching head, an over-loaded stomach, and the loss of reason, health, and time. I shall then eat and drink only to satisfy nature; I shall always enjoy an equal state of health; my ideas will be always pure and bright. All this is so easy, that there is no merit in attaining to it.

In the next place, said Memnon, continuing his soliloquy, I must think a little of my fortune. My desires are

are very moderate; my eſtate is well ſecured in the funds of Niniveh; I have enough to live independent, and that alone is a treaſure. I ſhall never be under the diſagreeable neceſſity of dancing attendance at courts; I ſhall envy no one, nor will any one ever envy me. Is there any difficulty in this? I have friends too; thoſe I ſhall preſerve, becauſe I will never give them any occaſion to quarrel with me; for I will ſhew no ill humour to them, nor they to me? How eaſy is all this?

Having thus planned his little ſcheme of wiſdom in his own room, Memnon put his head out of the window to look about him. He ſaw two women walking under the ſhade of the plantanes before his houſe. The one was old, and ſeemed to think of nothing; the other young, handſome, and apparently buried in thought: ſhe wept, ſhe ſighed, and this air of ſorrow added to her charms. Our ſage was touched, not with the beauty of the lady (for he was very certain he could not be ſuſceptible of ſuch a weakneſs), but with the affliction he ſaw her in. He deſcended into the ſtreet, and accoſted the fair Ninevite with an intention to comfort her by his wiſdom. This charming creature related to him in the moſt ſimple, yet pathetic manner, how an uncle, which ſhe had never had, by a thouſand villanies, artifices, and ſtratagems, had robbed her of an eſtate, which ſhe never poſſeſſed; and that ſhe had every thing to dread from his cruelty and oppreſſion. You appear to me, ſaid ſhe, to be a perſon of ſo much wiſdom and prudence, that if you will only be ſo obliging to go home with me to examine my affairs, I am certain you will be able to extricate me out of all my preſent difficulties. Memnon followed her without the leaſt heſitation, in order to examine her affairs according to the rules of wiſdom, and he gave her prudent counſel.

The afflicted lady led him into an apartment where the richeſt perfumes were burning, and very politely made him ſit down by her on a ſopha, where they continued for ſome time, with their legs acroſs, facing each other. The lady, while ſhe was talking, kept her eyes fixed on the ground, and every now and then a tear

ſtole down her cheeks: ſometimes ſhe would gently lift them up, and then they always met thoſe of the wiſe Memnon. Their converſation was full of a melting ſoftneſs that encreaſed every time they looked at each other. Memnon intereſted himſelf warmly in her affairs, and every inſtant felt a ſtronger deſire to oblige a perſon, who was at once ſo perfectly well bred, and ſo unfortunate. Carried away by the warmth of the converſation, they inſenſibly altered their poſitions; they were no longer over againſt each other. Memnon plied his counſel ſo cloſe, and gave her ſuch tender advice, that at length they both forgot the buſineſs they were talking about, and were left to the world and themſelves.

While they were in this critical ſituation, in comes the uncle, as may eaſily be ſuppoſed. He was armed cap-a-pié; and the firſt word he uttered was, that he would cut Memnon's and his niece's throat, as to be ſure he had great reaſon to do; and concluded with obſerving, that he might be prevailed on to ſpare their lives, in conſideration of a round ſum of money. Memnon found himſelf obliged to part with all he had about him. People were happy in thoſe times to get ſo well out of theſe ſort of adventures. America was not then diſcovered, and afflicted ladies were not then half ſo dangerous as they are at preſent.

Memnon, overwhelmed with confuſion and deſpair, returned home, where he found a letter from one of his moſt intimate friends to invite him to dinner. If I remain alone, ſaid he to himſelf, I ſhall have my mind ſo occupied with my unhappy adventure, that I ſhall not be able to eat a morſel, and may fall ill. It will be better to go and take a frugal repaſt with my friends; their agreeable ſociety will make me forget the folly I have been guilty of this morning. Accordingly to the rendezvous he goes: his friends find him melancholy: they urge him to drink, to drive away care. A little wine, taken in moderatiou, is an exhilerator of the ſpirits, and a ſtrengthener of the faculties. Thus thought the wiſe Memnon, and he got drunk. After dinner, it was propoſed to ſit down to play. Play within

in proper bounds, and among friends, is an agreeable and harmleſs recreation. He plays, he loſes all his ready money, and four times as much upon his word. A diſpute ariſes concerning the game; both parties grow warm; one of Memnon's intimate friends throws the dice-box at his head, and beats out one of his eyes. The wiſe Memnon is carried home drunk, pennyleſs, and with the loſs of an eye.

After ſleeping himſelf ſober, he ſends his man to his banker's for money to pay his intimate friends what he had loſt to them. His man returns with the melancholy tidings that his banker had gone off that morning with a vaſt ſum of money, which had thrown a hundred of the beſt families in Nineveh into a dreadful alarm. Memnon, enraged at this piece of villainy, repairs to court with a plaiſter on his eye, and a petition in his hand, to demand juſtice of the king againſt his banker. In the drawing-room he meets with ſeveral ladies walking about with hoops of twenty yards in circumference, with all the eaſe imaginable. One of them, who knew him, cried out, holding her fan up before her eyes, Oh! the fright! Another, who was more intimate with him, accoſts him thus: Servant, Mr. Memnon: upon my word, I am very glad to ſee you, Mr. Memnon; but pray, Mr. Memnon, how came you to loſe one of your eyes? And then ſwam acroſs the room, without waiting for his anſwer. Memnon hid himſelf in a corner, waiting an opportunity of throwing himſelf at the king's feet. The monarch appears. Memnon bows himſelf thrice to the earth, and preſents his petition; which his majeſty was pleaſed moſt graciouſly to receive; and then handed to one of his ſatraps, with orders to give him an account of its contents. The ſatrap takes Memnon aſide; and with an air of authority, accompanied with the moſt bitter ſneer, ſays to him, What a pretty one-eyed ſcoundrel you are, to apply to the king before you had ſpoken to me; and preſume to demand juſtice againſt a worthy bankrupt, whom I honour with my protection, and who is no leſs than nephew to my wife's waiting-woman. Heark ye,

my friend! if you have any regard for the eye you have left, take my advice, and drop this affair.

Thus Memnon, the wiſe Memnon, who, in the morning, had forſworn all commerce with women, made a vow of temperance, renounced gaming and quarrelling, and had determined never to be ſeen at court, was, before the night of the ſame day, cheated and robbed by a fine woman, got drunk, gamed, quarrelled with his moſt intimate friends, which coſt him the loſs of an eye, and made a viſit to court, where every one laughed at him.

Petrified with aſtoniſhment, and pierced with grief, he returned home with a heavy heart. He attempts to enter his own houſe, an officer puſhes him rudely back, and tells him, that his creditors have ſeized on all his goods for the money he owes them. Oppreſſed with theſe accumulated diſaſters, he throws himſelf lifeleſs under a plantane. At that inſtant the fair lady, whom he had comforted in the morning, paſſed by with her dear uncle; and ſeeing Memnon in that condition, and with a plaiſter on one eye, they both ſet up a horſe-laugh, and continued their way. Night came on, and Memnon was glad to lie upon a truſs of ſtraw before his own door. He is ſeized with a fever. In the interval of the fit he falls aſleep, when a celeſtial ſpirit appears to him in a dream—

A bright glory environed him: he had ſix beautiful wings; but neither head, feet, nor tail; and reſembled nothing that has ever been ſeen. Who art thou? ſaid Memnon. Thy good genius, replied the phantom. Reſtore me my eye then, ſaid Memnon, my health, my wealth, and my wiſdom; and then he related to him how he had loſt them them all in a day. Theſe accidents never happen to us in the world we inhabit, ſaid the ſpirit. And pray what world may that be? aſked the man of ſorrows. My country, replied the other, is about five hundred millions of leagues beyond the ſun, in a little ſtar called Sirius, which you may ſee from hence. A charming country, I warrant it, ſaid Memnon. I ſuppoſe now you have no jilts there, that fret a poor man? no intimate friends, that ſtrip him at play,

play, and afterwards beat one of his eyes out? no raſcally bankers, that break with all your effects in their hands? nor no ſatraps, that make a jeſt of you when you come to demand juſtice? No, ſaid the ſtarry inhabitant, we have nothing of all this. We are never cheated by women, becauſe we have no commerce with them; nor are we guilty of exceſs at table, becauſe we never eat or drink any thing; we have no bankrupts amongſt us, becauſe we have neither gold nor ſilver; we are in no danger of having our eyes beat out, becauſe we have no material bodies like yours; nor are there any ſatraps who can do us injuſtice, becauſe in the ſtar Sirius every one is equal.

But pray, good dinnerleſs and womanleſs Sir, demanded Memnon, how may you paſs your time? In watching over the other globes that are committed to our care, ſaid the genius; and I am now come to comfort thee. Ah! cried Memnon, ſtung with bitter remembrance, why waſt thou not preſent with me laſt night, to prevent my being guilty of ſo many follies? I was attending on thy elder brother Haſſan, ſaid the heavenly being: his fate is more deplorable than thine. His moſt gracious majeſty the king of the Indies, at whoſe court he has the honour to be, has ordered both his eyes to be picked out for a little indiſcretion he has been guilty of; and he is at this inſtant chained hands and feet in the bottom of a dungeon. It is of great uſe indeed, cried out Memnon, to have a good genius in a family, when one brother loſes an eye, and the other is ſtark blind; one lies upon ſtraw, and the other in a priſon! Thy fortune ſhall change, replied the ætherial meſſenger: thou wilt be always blind of an eye indeed; but, that excepted, thy life will be tolerably happy, provided thou never more formeſt the ridiculous deſign of being perfectly wiſe. Alas! cried Memnon with a ſigh, is it impoſſible then to attain to it? As much ſo replied the genius, as to be perfectly ſkilful, perfectly ſtrong, perfectly powerful, or perfectly happy. We ourſelves are at a great diſtance from it. There is a globe, indeed, where all theſe are found; but in the hundred millions of millions of worlds that

are

are diſperſed through the immenſity of ſpace, every thing holds its degree. In the ſecond globe there is leſs wiſdom and felicity than in the firſt; leſs again in the third than in the ſecond; and ſo of the reſt to the very loweſt, where the inhabitants are all fools. I am very much afraid then, ſaid Memnon, that this ſame terraqueous globe of ours is the bedlam of the univerſe you have been pleaſed to deſcribe to me. Not quite, ſaid the ſpirit; but it comes pretty near to it. Every thing muſt be in its place. Well, but, ſaid Memnon, certain philoſophers and poets muſt have been confoundedly out, when they tell us, "that whatever is, is right." They were juſt, replied the philoſopher of the upper regions, ſo far as relates to the diſpoſition of the whole univerſe. Ah! cried poor Memnon, you ſhall never make be believe that, ſo long as I have only one eye.

A LETTER

A LETTER from a

TURK,

CONCERNING THE

FAQUIRS and his Friend BABABEC.

WHEN I was in the city of Benarez, on the borders of the Ganges, the country of the antient Brachmans, I endeavoured to inſtruct myſelf in their religion and manners. I underſtood the Indian language tolerably well. I heard a great deal, and remarked every thing. I lodged at the houſe of my correſpondent Omri, who was the moſt worthy man I ever knew. He was of the religion of the Bramins: I have the honour to be a Muſſulman. We never exchanged one word higher than another about Mahomet or Brama. We performed our ablutions each on his own ſide; we drank of the ſame ſherbet, and we eat of the ſame rice, as if we had been two brothers.

One day we went together to the pagoda of Gavani. There we ſaw ſeveral bands of Fakirs, ſome of whom were Janguis; that is to ſay, contemplative Fakirs; and other diſciples of the antient Gymnoſophiſts, who led an active life. They have all a learned language peculiar to themſelves; it is that of the moſt antient Brachmans; and they have a book written in this language, which they call the Hanſcrit. It is, beyond all contradiction, the moſt antient book in all Aſia, not excepting the Zend.

I happened to croſs a Fakir, who was reading in this book. Ah! wretched Infidel! cried he, thou haſt made me loſe a number of vowels that I was counting, which

which will occaſion my ſoul to paſs into the body of a hare inſtead of that of a parrot, with which I had before the greateſt reaſon to flatter myſelf. I gave him a roupee to comfort him for the accident. In going a few paces farther, I had the misfortune to ſneeze; the noiſe I made rouzed a Fakir who was in a trance. Heavens! cried he, what a dreadful noiſe! Where am I? I can no longer ſee the tip of my noſe*! the heavenly light has diſappeared. If I am the cauſe, ſaid I, of your ſeeing further than the length of your noſe, here is a roupee to repair the injury I have done you: ſquint again, and reſume the heavenly light.

Having thus brought myſelf off diſcreetly enough, I paſſed over to the ſide of the Gymnoſophiſts, ſeveral of whom brought me a parcel of mighty pretty nails to drive into my arms and thighs, in honour of Brama. I bought their nails, and made uſe of them to faſten down my boxes. Others were dancing upon their hands, others cut capers on the ſlack rope, and others went always upon one foot. There were ſome who dragged a heavy chain about with them, and others carried a pack ſaddle; ſome had their heads always in a buſhel; the beſt people in the world to live with. My friend Omri carried me to the cell of one of the moſt famous of theſe. His name was Bababec: he was as naked as he was born, and had a great chain about his neck, that weighed upwards of ſixty pounds. He ſate on a wooden chair, very neatly decorated with little points of nails, that run into his poſteriors; and you would have thought he had been ſitting on a velvet cuſhion. Numbers of women flocked to him to conſult him: he was the oracle of all the families in the neighbourhood; and was, truly ſpeaking, in great reputation. I was witneſs to a long converſation that Omri had with him. Do you think, father, ſaid my friend, that after having gone through ſeven metempſichoſes, I may at length arrive at the habitation of Brama? That is

a;

* When the Fakirs have a mind to ſee the heavenly light, which very frequently happens with them, they turn their eyes downwards towards the tip of their noſe.

as it may happen, ſaid the Fakir. What ſort of life do you lead? I endeavour, anſwered Omri, to be a good ſubject, a good huſband, a good father, and a good friend. I lend money without intereſt to the rich who want it, and I give it to the poor: I preſerve peace amongſt my neigbbours. But have you ever run nails into your backſide? demanded the Bramin. Never, reverend father. I am ſorry for it, replied the father; very ſorry for it, indeed: It is a thouſand pities; but you will certainly not reach above the nineteenth heaven. No higher! ſaid Omri. In troth, I am very well contented with my lot. What is it to me whether I go into the nineteenth or the twentieth, provided I do my duty in my pilgrimage, and am well received at the end of my journey? Is it not as much as one can deſire, to live with a fair character in this world, and be happy with Brama in the next? And pray what heaven do you think of going to, good Maſter Bababec, with your nails and your chain? Into the thirty-fifth, ſaid Bababec. I admire your modeſty, replied Omri, to pretend to be better lodged than me: this is ſurely the mere effects of an exceſſive ambition. How can you, who condemn others that covet honours in this world, arrogate ſuch diſtinguiſhed ones to yourſelf in the next? What right have you to be better treated than me? Know, that I beſtow more alms to the poor in ten days, than the nails you run into your backſide coſt for ten years! What is it to Brama, that you paſs the whole day ſtark naked with a chain about your neck? This is doing a notable ſervice to your country, doubtleſs; I have a thouſand times more eſteem for the man who ſows pulſe or plants trees for all your tribe, than they who look at the tip of their noſes, or carry a pack-ſaddle to ſhew their magnanimity. Having finiſhed this ſpeech, Omri ſoftened his voice, embraced the Bramin, and, with an endearing ſweetneſs, beſought him to throw aſide his nails and his chain, to go home with him, and live with decency and comfort. The Faquir was perſuaded: he was waſhed clean, rubbed with eſſences and perfumes, and clad in a decent

cent habit: he lived a fortnight in this manner, behaved with prudence and wiſdom, and acknowledged that he was a thouſand times more happy than before: but he loſt his credit among the people; the women no longer crouded to conſult him: he therefore quitted the houſe of the friendly Omri, and returned to his nails and his chain, to regain his reputation.

OF VAIN GLORY:

BEING

The Subſtance of a CONVERSATION with a Chineſe.

IN the year 1723, there was a Chineſe in Holland, who was both a learned man and a merchant, two things that ought by no means to be incompatible; but which, thanks to the profound reſpect that is ſhewn to money, and the little regard that the human ſpecies do, and ever will, pay to merit, are become ſo among us.

This Chineſe, who ſpoke a little Dutch, happened to be in a bookſeller's ſhop, at the ſame time that ſome literati were aſſembled there. He aſked for a book; they offered him Boſſuet's Univerſal Hiſtory, badly tranſlated. At the title Univerſal Hiſtory, how pleaſed am I, cried the Oriental, to have met with this book; I ſhall now ſee what is ſaid of our great empire; of a nation that has ſubſiſted for upwards of fifty thouſand years; of that long dynaſty of emperors who have governed us for ſuch a number of ages. I ſhall ſee what theſe Europeans think of the religion of our literati, and of that pure and ſimple worſhip we pay to the Supreme Being. What a pleaſure will it be to me to find how they ſpeak of our arts, many of which are of a more antient date with us than the æras of all the kingdoms of Europe! I fancy the author will be greatly miſtaken in relation to the war we had about twenty-two thouſand five hundred and fifty-two years ago, with the martial people of Tonquin and Japan, as well as the ſolemn ambaſſy that the powerful emperor of Mogulitan ſent, to requeſt a body of laws from us in the year of the world 500000000000079123450000. Lord bleſs

bleſs you, ſaid one of the literati, there is hardly any mention made of that nation in this book, it is too inconſiderable. Almoſt the whole of it is taken up with an account of the firſt nation in the world, the only nation, thoſe great people the Jews.

The Jews! ſaid the Chineſe, thoſe people then muſt certainly be maſters of three parrs of the globe at leaſt. They hope to be ſo one day, anſwered the other; but at preſent they are thoſe pedlars that you ſee going about here with toys and knicknacks, and that ſometimes do us the honour to clip our gold and ſilver. Surely you are not ſerious, ſaid the Chineſe, could thoſe people ever have been in poſſeſſion of a vaſt empire? Here I joined in the converſation, and told him, that for a few years they were in poſſeſſion of a ſmall country to themſelves; but that we were not to judge of a people from the extent of their dominions, any more than of a man by his riches.

But does not this book take notice of ſome other nations, demanded the man of letters. Undoubtedly, replied a learned gentleman who ſtood at my elbow; it treats largely of a ſmall country about ſixty leagues wide, called Egypt, in which it is ſaid that there is a lake of one hundred and fifty leagues in circumference, made by the hands of man. My god! exclaimed the Chineſe, a lake of one hundred and fifty leagues in circumference, within a ſpot of ground only ſixty leagues wide, this is very curious! The inhabitants of that country, continued the doctor, were all ſages. What happy times were thoſe, cry'd the Chineſe, but is that all? No, reply'd the other, there is mention made of thoſe famous people the Greeks. Greeks! Greeks! ſaid the Aſiatic, who are thoſe Greeks? Why, reply'd the philoſopher, they were maſters of a little province, about the two hundredth part as large as China, but whoſe fame ſpread over the whole world. Indeed! ſaid the Chineſe, with an air of openneſs and ingenuouſneſs, I declare I never heard the leaſt mention of theſe people, either in the Mogul's country, in Japan, or in Great Tartary.

Oh,

Oh, the barbarian, the ignorant creature! cry'd out the ſage, very politely. Why then I ſuppoſe you know nothing of Epaminondas the Theban, nor of the Piræan Haven, nor the names of Achilles's two horſes, nor of Silenus's aſs? You have never heard ſpeak of Jupiter, nor of Diogenes, nor of Laïs, nor of Cybele, nor of——

I am very much afraid, ſaid the learned Oriental, interrupting him, that you know nothing of that eternelly memorable adventure of the famous Xixoſan Concochigramki, nor of the myſteries of the great Fi-pſi-hi-hi. But pray tell me what other unknown things does this Univerſal Hiſtory treat of? Upon this my learned neighbour harrangued for a quarter of an hour together about the Roman republic, and when he came to Julius Cæſar, the Chineſe ſtopped him, and very gravely ſaid, I think I have heard of him, was he not a Turk? *

How! cry'd our ſage in a fury, don't you ſo much as know the difference between Pagans, Chriſtians, and Mahometans? Did you never hear of Conſtantine? Do you know nothing of the hiſtory of the popes? We have heard ſomething confuſedly of one Mahomet, reply'd the Aſiatic.

It is impoſſible ſure, ſaid the other, but you muſt have heard at leaſt of Luther, Zuinglius, Bellarmin, and Oecolampadius. I ſhall never remember all thoſe names, ſaid the Chineſe; and ſo ſaying he quitted the ſhop, and went to ſell a large quantity of Pekoa tea, and fine callicoe, with which he bought two fine girls, and a young lad, and ſet ſail for his own country, adoring *Tien*, and recommending himſelf to Confucius.

As to myſelf, the converſation I had been witneſs to, plainly diſcovered to me the nature of vain glory; and I could not forbear exclaiming, Since Cæſar and Jupiter are names unknown to the fineſt, moſt antient, moſt extenſive, moſt populous, and moſt civilized kingdom in

* Not long ſince the Chineſe took all the Europeans to be Mahometans.

in the univerſe, it becomes ye well, O ye rulers of petty ſtates! ye pulpit orators of a narrow pariſh, or a little town! ye doctors of Salamanca, or of Courges! ye trifling authors, and ye heavy commentators! It becomes you well indeed, to aſpire at reputation.

OF SUICIDE; OR, SELF-MURDER.

PHILIP MORDAUNT, couſin-german to the famous earl of Peterborough, who was ſo well known in all the courts of Europe, and who made his boaſt that he had ſeen more poſtilions, and more crowned heads, than any other man in the world; this Philip Mordaunt, I ſay, was a young man about twenty-ſeven, handſome, well made, rich, of an illuſtrious family, and one who might pretend to any thing; and what was more than all the reſt, he was paſſionately beloved by his miſtreſs. However, this man took a diſtaſte to life, diſcharged all that he owed, wrote to his friends to take leave of them, and even compoſed ſome verſes upon the occaſion, which concluded thus, that "tho' opium might be ſome relief to a wiſe man, if diſguſted with the world, yet in his opinion a piſtol, and a little reſolution, were much more effectual remedies." His behaviour was ſuitable to his principles; and he diſpatched himſelf with a piſtol, without giving any other reaſon for it than that his ſoul was weary of his body, and that when we diſlike our houſe we ought to quit it. One would imagine he choſe to die becauſe he was weary of being happy.

One Richard Smith has lately exhibited a moſt extraordinary inſtance of this nature to the world. This Smith was tired of being really unhappy: he had been rich, and was reduced to poverty: he had been healthy, and was become infirm: he had a wife, to whom he had nothing to give but a ſhare in his misfortunes; and an infant in the cradle was the only thing he had left.

left. Richard Smith and his wife Bridget then, after having affectionately embraced, and given each a formal kiſs to their child, firſt cut the poor little creature's throat, and then hanged themſelves at the foot of their bed. I do not remember, to have heard any where of ſuch a ſcene of horrors committed in cold blood; but the letter, which theſe unhappy wretches wrote to their couſin Mr. Brindley before their death, is as remarkable as the manner itſelf of their death. "We are certain, ſaid they, of meeting with forgiveneſs from God, &c. We put an end to our lives becauſe we were miſerable, without any proſpect of relief; and we have done our child that ſervice to put it out of life, for fear it ſhould have been as miſerable as ourſelves, &c." It is to be obſerved, that theſe people, after having murdered their child out of their paternal affection, wrote to a friend, recommending their dog and cat to his care. They thought, probably, that it was eaſier to make their dog and cat happy in this world than their child, and that the keeping them would not be any great expence to their friend *.

The earl of Scarborough has lately quitted life with the ſame indifference as he did his place of maſter of the horſe. Having been told in the houſe of lords that he ſided with the court, on account of the profitable poſt he held in it, My lords, ſaid he, to convince you that my opinion is not influenced by any ſuch conſideration, I will inſtantly reſign. He afterwards found himſelf perplexed between a miſtreſs he was fond of, but to whom he was under no engagements, and a woman whom he eſteemed, and to whom he had made a promiſe of marriage. My lord Scarborough, therefore, killed himſelf to get rid of difficulty †.

The

* Richard Smith was a bookbinder, and priſoner for debt within the liberty of the king's-bench; and this ſhocking tragedy was acted in the year 1732. Smith and his wife had been always induſtrious and frugal, invincibly honeſt, and remarkable for conjugal affection.

† Lord S———h's immediate motive for ſuicide was ſaid to be remorſe for having weakly diſcovered to a lady a ſecret of ſtate,

The many tragical ſtories of this nature, with which the Engliſh news-papers abound, have made the greateſt part of Europe imagine, that the Engliſh are fonder of killing themſelves than any other people: and yet I queſtion much whether there are not as many madmen at Paris as at London; and if our news-papers were to keep an exact regiſter of thoſe who have either had the folly, or unhappy reſolution to deſtroy themſelves, we might in this reſpect be found to vie with the Engliſh. But our compilers of news are more prudent; the adventures of private perſons are never ſet forth to public ſcandal in any of the papers licenſed by the government: however, I believe I may venture to affirm, that this rage of ſuicide will never become epidemical. Nature has ſufficiently guarded againſt it, and hope and fear are the powerful curbs ſhe makes uſe of to ſtop the hand of the wretch uplifted to be his own executioner.

I know it may be ſaid, that there have been countries where a council was eſtabliſhed to give licence to the people to kill themſelves, when they could give ſufficient reaſons for doing it. To this I anſwer, that either the fact is falſe, or that ſuch council found very little employment.

There is one thing indeed which may cauſe ſome ſurprize, and which I think deſerves to be ſeriouſly diſcuſſed, which is, that almoſt all the great heroes among the Romans, during the civil wars, killed themſelves when they loſt a battle, and that we do not find an inſtance of a ſingle leader or great man, in the diſputes of the League, the Fronde, or during the troubles of Italy and Germany, who put an end to his life with his own hand. It is true, that theſe latter were Chriſtians, and that there is great difference between a Chriſtian ſoldier and a Pagan; and yet, how comes it that thoſe very men who were ſo eaſily with-held by Chriſtianity, from putting an end to their own lives, ſhould be reſtrained either by that or any other conſideration. when they

ſtate, intruſted to him by his ſovereign: but, in truth it ſeems to have been the effect of a temporary delirium, owing to a conſtitutional diſorder.

they had a mind to poiſon, aſſaſſinate, or publicly execute a vanquiſhed enemy? Does not the Chriſtian religion forbid this manner of taking away the life of a fellow creature, if poſſible, more than that of our own? The advocates for ſuicide tells us, that it is very allowable to quit our houſe when we are weary of it. Agreed: but moſt men had rather lie in a bad houſe, than ſleep in the open fields.

I one day received a circulatory letter from an Engliſhman, in which he propoſes a premium to the perſon, who ſhould the moſt clearly demonſtrate that it was allowable for a man to kill himſelf. I made him no anſwer, for I had nothing to prove to him, and he had only to examine within himſelf if he preferred death to life.

But then let us aſk why Cato, Brutus, Caſſius, Anthony, Otho, and ſo many others, gave themſelves death with ſo much reſolution, and that our leaders of parties ſuffered themſelves to be taken alive by their enemies, or waſte the remains of a wretched old age in a dungeon? Some refined wits pretend to ſay, that the antients had no real courage; that Cato acted like a coward in putting an end to his own life; and that he would have ſhewed more greatneſs of ſoul in crouching beneath the victorious Cæſar. This may be very well in an ode, or as a figure in rhetoric; but it is very certain there muſt be ſome courage to reſign a life coolly by the edge of a ſword, ſome ſtrength of mind thus to overcome the moſt powerful inſtinct of nature: in a word, that ſuch an act ſhews a greater ſhare of ferocity than weakneſs. When a ſick man is in a phrenzy, we cannot ſay he has no ſtrength, though we may ſay it is the ſtrength of a mad man.

Self-murder was forbid by the Pagan as well as by the Chriſtian religion. There was even a place allotted in hell to thoſe who put an end to their own lives. Witneſs theſe lines of the poet.

Proxima

Proxima deinde tenent mœſti loca, qui ſibi lethum
Inſontes peperere manu, lucemque peroſi
Projecere animas. Quam vellent æthere in alto
Nunc & pauperiem, & duros perferre labores!
Fata obſtant, triſtique Palus inamabilis unda
Adligat, & novies Styx interfuſa coërcet.

VIRG. Æn. lib. vi. v. 434, &c.

Then crowds ſucceed, who prodigal of breath,
Themſelves anticipate the doom of death;
Tho' free from guilt, they caſt their lives away,
And ſad and ſullen hate the golden day.
Oh! with what joy the wretches now would bear
Pain, toil, and woe, to breathe the vital air!
In vain! by fate for ever are they bound
With dire Avernus, and the lake profound;
And Styx with nine wide channels roars around.

PITT.

This was the religion of the heathens; and notwithſtanding the torments they were to meet with in the other world, it was eſteemed an honour to quit this by giving themſelves death by their own hands; ſo contradictory are the manners of men! Is not the cuſtom of duelling ſtill unhappily accounted honourable amongſt us, tho' prohibited by reaſon, by religion, and by all laws divine and human? If Cato and Cæſar, Anthony and Auguſtus, did not challenge each other to a duel, it was not that they were leſs brave than ourſelves. If the duke of Montmorenci, marechal Marrillac, de Thou, Cinq-Mars, and many others, rather choſe to be dragged to execution like the vileſt miſcreants, than put an end to their own lives like Cato and Brutus, it was not that they had leſs courage than thoſe Romans: the true reaſon is, that it was not then the faſhion at Paris to kill one's ſelf on ſuch occaſions; whereas it was an eſtabliſhed cuſtom with the Romans.

The women on the Malabar coaſt throw themſelves alive into the flames, in which the bodies of

their dead huſbands are burning. Is it becauſe they have more reſolution than Cornelia? No; but the cuſtom of the country is for wives to to burn themſelves.

Cuſtom and fancy of our fate decide,
And what is this man's ſhame is t'other's pride.

OF

OF THE

RELIGION

Of the QUAKERS.

BEING of opinion that the doctrine and hiſtory of ſo extraordinary a ſect as the Quakers were very well deſerving the curioſity of every thinking man, I reſolved to make myſelf acquainted with them, and for that purpoſe made a viſit to one of the moſt eminent of that ſect in England, who, after having been in trade for thirty years, had the wiſdom to preſcribe limits to his fortune, and to his deſires, and withdrew to a ſmall but pleaſant retirement in the country, not many miles from London. Here it was that I made him my viſit. His houſe was ſmall, but neatly built, and with no other ornaments but thoſe of decency and convenience. The quaker himſelf was a hale ruddy-complexioned old man, who had never ſuffered from ſickneſs, becauſe he had always been a ſtranger to paſſions and intemperance. I never in my life ſaw any one have a more noble, or a more engaging aſpect. He was dreſt after the faſhion of thoſe of his perſuaſion, in a plain coat, without plaits in the ſides, or buttons on the pockets and ſleeves; and he wore a beaver hat, the brim of which flapped downwards like thoſe of our clergy. He advanced towards me without moving his hat, or making the leaſt inclination of his body; but there appeared more real politeneſs in the open humane air of his countenance, than in drawing one leg behind the other, and carrying that in the hand which is made to be worn on the head. Friend, ſays he, I perceive thou art a ſtranger, if I can do thee any ſervice thou haſt only to let me know it. Sir, I reply'd, bowing my body, and ſliding one leg to-

wards him, as is the cuſtom with us, I flatter myſelf that my curioſity, which you will allow to be juſt, will not give you any offence, and that you'll do me the honour to inform me of the particulars of your religion. The people of thy country, anſwered the Quaker, are too full of their bows and their compliments; but I never yet met with one of them who had ſo much curioſity as thyſelf. Come in and let us dine firſt together. I ſtill continued to make ſome ſilly compliments, it not being eaſy to diſengage one's ſelf at once from habits we have been long accuſtomed to; and after taking part of a frugal meal, which began and ended with a prayer to God, I began to put queſtions to my plain hoſt.

I opened with that which good Catholics have more than once made to Hugonots. My dear Sir, ſays I, were you ever baptized? No, friend, replied the Quaker, nor any of my brethren. Zounds! ſays I to him, you are not Chriſtians then! Friend, replies the old man, in a ſoft tone of voice, do not ſwear; we are Chriſtians, but we do not think that ſprinkling a few drops of water on a child's head makes him a Chriſtian. My god! exclaimed I, ſhocked at his impiety, have you then forgot that Chriſt was baptized by St. John? Friend, replies the mild Quaker, once again, do not ſwear. Chriſt was baptized by John, but he himſelf never baptized any one: now we profeſs ourſelves diſciples of Chriſt, and not of John. Mercy on us, cry'd I, what a fine ſubject you would be for the holy inquiſitor! In the name of God, my good old man, let me baptize you. Were that all, replied he very gravely, we would ſubmit cheerfully to be baptized, purely in compliance with thy weakneſs; for we do not condemn any perſon who uſes that rite; but, on the other hand, we think that thoſe who profeſs a religion of ſo holy and ſpiritual a nature as that of Chriſt, ought to abſtain, to the utmoſt of their power, from Jewiſh ceremonies.

Why there again! ſays I, baptiſm a Jewiſh ceremony! Yes, my friend, ſays he, and ſo truly Jewiſh, that many Jews uſe the baptiſm of John to this day. Peruſe ancient authors, and they will ſhew thee, that John only

only revived this practice, and that it was in uſe among the Hebrews long before his time, the ſame as the pilgrimage to Mecca was among the Iſhmaelites. Jeſus indeed ſubmitted to be baptized of John, in the like manner as he had undergone circumciſion; but both the one and the other ceremony were to end in the baptiſm of Chriſt, that baptiſm of the ſpirit, that ablution of the ſoul which is the ſalvation of mankind. Thus the forerunner John ſaid, *I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whoſe ſhoes I am not worthy to bear: he ſhall baptize you with the Holy Ghoſt, and with fire.* St. Paul likewiſe, the great apoſtle of the Gentiles, writes thus to the Corinthians, Chriſt ſent me not to baptize but to preach the goſpel. Accordingly Paul never baptized but two perſons with water, and that againſt his inclination. He circumciſed his diſciple Timothy; and the other apoſtles circumciſed all thoſe who were deſirous of it. Art thou circumciſed? added he. I really have not that honour; reply'd I. Wilt thou, friend? reply'd the Quaker; thou art a Chriſtian without being circumciſed, and I am one without being baptized.

Thus did my pious hoſt make a falſe but very ſpecious application of three or four paſſages of holy writ, which ſeemed to favour the tenets of his ſect; but, at the ſame time, forgot, very ſincerely, above an hundred others that directly overturned them. I reſolved not to contend with him, as there is nothing to be gained by arguing with an enthuſiaſt: one ſhould never pretend to diſcover to a lover his miſtreſs's faults, to a lawyer the weakneſs of one's cauſe, nor force the truth upon a fanatic. Accordingly I proceeded to other queſtions.

Pray, ſays I to him, in what manner do you communicate? We have no ſuch ceremony amongſt us, replied he, How! ſaid I, have you no communion? No, anſwered he, no other than that of hearts. He then began again to quote his texts of ſcripture, and read me a very curious lecture againſt the ſacrament; and harangued with a tone of inſpiration to prove, that the ſacraments were mere human inventions, and that the word *ſacrament* was not once mentioned in the Scripture. I muſt

aſk thy excuſe, ſaid he, for my ignorance; for I am ſenſible I have not employed an hundredth part of the arguments, that might be made uſe of, to prove the truth of our religion: but thou mayſt ſee them all amply unfolded in the Expoſition of our Faith, written by Robert Barclay. It is one of the beſt books that ever came from the hand of man: our very adverſaries confeſs it is dangerous, and that is ſufficient alone to prove its goodneſs. I promiſed to peruſe this piece; and my Quaker thought he had already made a convert.

He then proceeded to give me a brief account of certain ſingularities, which make this ſect the contempt of others. Confeſs, ſaid he, that it was very difficult for thee to refrain from laughing, when I anſwered all thy compliments without uncovering my head, and, at the ſame time, ſpoke to thee only with *thee* and *thou*. However, thou appeareſt to me too well read not to know, that, in Chriſt's time, no nation was ſo ridiculous as to uſe the plural for the ſingular. They ſaid to Auguſtus Cæſar himſelf, *I love thee, I beſeech thee, I thank thee*; and he would not even ſuffer himſelf to be called *Domine*, Sir. It was not till long after his time that men took the ridiculous notion of having themſelves called *you*, inſtead of *thou*, as if they were double, and uſurped the impertinent titles of *lordſhip*, *eminence*, and *holineſs*, which poor reptiles beſtow on other reptiles like themſelves; aſſuring them, that they are, *with the moſt profound reſpect*, and an infamous falſhood, their *moſt obedient humble ſervants*. It is the more effectually to ſecure ourſelves againſt this ſhameful traffic of lies and flattery, that we *thee* and *thou* a king, with the ſame freedom as we do his meaneſt ſervant; and ſalute no perſon, as owing mankind only charity, and reſpect only to the laws.

We dreſs alſo differently from others, and this purely that it may be a perpetual warning to us not to imitate them. While others pride themſelves on wearing the badges of their ſeveral dignities, we confine ourſelves to thoſe of chriſtian humility. We ſhun all the aſſemblies of the gay, we avoid places of diverſions of all kinds, and carefully abſtain from gaming; for wretched

would

would be our ſtate, indeed, were we to fill with ſuch levities the heart that ought to be the habitation of God. We never ſwear, not even in a court of juſtice; being of opinion, that the name of the Moſt High ought not to be proſtituted in the frivolous conteſts between man and man. When we are obliged to appear before a magiſtrate, upon the concerns of others (for law-ſuits are unknown among *the Friends*), we affirm the truth by our *yea* or *nay*, and they believe us on our ſimple affirmation, while other Chriſtians are daily perjuring themſelves on the bleſſed Goſpels. We never take up arms, not that we are fearful of death: on the contrary, we bleſs the inſtant that unites us to the Being of Beings. The reaſon is, that we are neither wolves, tygers, nor maſtiffs, but men and chriſtians. Our God, who has commanded us to love our enemies, and to ſuffer without repining, can certainly not order us to croſs the ſeas, and cut the throats of our fellow-creatures, as often as murderers, cloathed in ſcarlet, and wearing caps two feet high, enliſt peaceful citizens by a noiſe made with two ſticks on an aſs's ſkin extended. And when, after the gaining of a battle, all London blazes with illuminations, when the air glows with fire-works, and a noiſe is heard of thankſgivings, of bells, of organs, and of cannon, we groan in ſilence for the cruel havock which occaſions theſe public rejoicings.

OF THE

RELIGION of the QUAKERS, continued.

SUCH was the ſubſtance of the converſation I had with this very ſingular perſon *; and I was greatly ſurpriſed when, the Sunday following, he came to take me with him to one of their meetings. There are ſeveral of theſe in London; but that which he carried me to, ſtands near the famous pillar called the Monument. The brethren were already aſſembled when I entered with my guide. There might be about four hundred men, and three hundred women, in the place. The

* The name of this Quaker was Andrew Pit; and the whole of the preceding chapter is ſtrictly true, except in a very few circumſtances. Andrew Pit lately wrote to the author, to complain that he had a little amplified facts; aſſuring him at the ſame time, that God was greatly offended at his having diverted himſelf and his readers at the expence of the Quakers †.

† In conſequence of the firſt publication of theſe letters concerning the Quakers, an anſwer was written and ſent to the author by one of that people. The deſign of it was to give him an opportunity of correcting, in the ſubſequent editions, the errors of his firſt: but theſe letters having been ſince publiſhed without any ſuch correction, the anſwer was printed, that every reader might judge for himſelf.

The Quakers complain, that M. de Voltaire miſtook his talents, when he meddled with religion; the facetious levity of his expreſſion being quite unſuitable to the ſerious gravity of ſuch a ſubject. The vivacity of his ſtile, and the delicacy of his diction (ſay they), are very pleaſant and entertaining: but *errors* in *fact*, ſo clad, are the more dangerous; the frequency of which, in his third and fourth letters, beſpeaks him not well read in the hiſtory he undertook to write. For a refutation of thoſe errors, and as the means of obviating the author's miſrepreſentations of the Quakers, the curious reader is referred to the Letter abovementioned, and to Penn's Riſe and Progreſs of that People, printed by L. Hind in George-yard, Lombard-ſtreet.

The women hid their faces with their hoods, and the men were covered with their broad-brimmed hats. All were ſitting, and there was an univerſal ſilence amongſt them. I paſt through the midſt of them; but not one lifted up his eyes to look at me. This ſilence laſted a quarter of an hour; when at laſt an old man roſe up, took off his hat, and after making a number of wry faces, and groaning in a moſt lamentable manner, he, half mouthing, half ſnuffling, threw out a heap of unaccountable ſtuff, (taken, as he thought, from the Goſpel) which neither himſelf nor any of his auditors underſtood. When this religious buffoon had ended his curious ſoliloquy, and that the aſſembly broke up, very much edified, and very ſtupid, I aſked my guide, how it was poſſible the judicious part of them could ſuffer ſuch incoherent prating? We are obliged, ſaid he, to ſuffer it, becauſe no one knows, when a brother riſes up to hold forth, whether he will be moved by the ſpirit or by folly. In this uncertainty, we liſten patiently to every one. We even allow our women to ſpeak in public: two or three of them are often inſpired at the ſame time, and then a moſt charming noiſe is heard in the Lord's houſe. You have no prieſts, then? ſaid I. No, no, friend, replied the Quaker, heaven make us thankful! Then opening one of the books of their ſect, he read the following words in an emphatic tone: God forbid we ſhould preſume to ordain any one to receive the Holy Spirit on the Lord's day, in excluſion to the reſt of the faithful! Thanks to the Almighty, we are the only people upon the earth that have no prieſts! Wouldſt thou deprive us of ſo happy a diſtinction? Wherefore ſhould we abandon our child to hireling nurſes, when we ourſelves have milk enough to nouriſh it? Theſe mercenary creatures would quickly domineer in our houſes, and oppreſs both the mother and the child. God has ſaid, You have received freely, give as freely. Shall we, after this injunction, barter, as it were, the Goſpel; ſell the Holy Spirit, and make of an aſſembly of Chriſtians a mere ſhop of traders? We do not give money to a ſet of men, cloathed in black, to aſſiſt our poor, to bury our dead, or to preach to the

brethren: theſe holy offices are held in too high eſteem by us to intruſt them to others." "But how, ſaid I, with ſome warmth, how can you pretend to know whether your diſcourſe is really inſpired by the Almighty? Whoſoever, replied my friend, ſhall implore Chriſt to enlighten him, and ſhall publiſh the truths contained in the Goſpel, of which he inwardly feels, ſuch a one may be aſſured that he is inſpired by the Lord. He then overwhelmed me with a multitude of ſcripture quotations, which proved, as he imagined, that there is no ſuch thing as Chriſtianity, without an immediate revelation: and added theſe remarkable words: When thou moveſt one of thy limbs, is it moved by thy own power? Certainly not; for this limb is often liable to involuntary motions; conſequently he who created thy body gives motion to this earthly tabernacle. Or are the ſeveral ideas, of which thy ſoul receives the impreſſion, of thy own formation? Still leſs ſo; for they come upon thee whether thou wilt or no, conſequently thou receiveſt thy ideas from him who created thy ſoul. But as he leaves thy heart at full liberty, he gives thy mind ſuch ideas as thy heart may deſerve: if thou liveſt in God, thou acteſt and thinkeſt in God. After this, thou needeſt but open thine eyes to that light which enlightens all mankind, and then thou wilt perceive the truth, and make others perceive it. Why, this, ſays I, is our Malbranche's doctrine to a tittle. I am acquainted with thy Malbranche, ſaid he: he had ſomething of the Quaker in him; but he was not enough ſo.

Theſe are the moſt conſiderable particulars I have been able to gather, concerning the doctrine of the Quakers. In the enſuing pages you will find ſome account of their hiſtory, which is ſtill more ſingular than their opinions.

HISTORY

THE HISTORY of the QUAKERS.

YOU have already heard that the Quakers date their epocha from Chriſt, who, according to them, was the firſt Quaker. Religion, ſay they, was corrupted almoſt immediately after his death, and remained in that ſtate of corruption about ſixteen hundred years. But there were always a few of the faithful concealed in the world, who carefully preſerved the ſacred fire, which was extinguiſhed in all but themſelves; till at length this light ſhone out in England in 1642.

It was at the time when Great Britain was diſtracted by inteſtine wars, which three or four ſects had raiſed in the name of God, that one George Fox, a native of Leiceſterſhire, and ſon to a ſilk-weaver, took it into his head to preach the Word, and, as he pretended, with all the requiſites of a true apoſtle; that is, without being able either to read or write. He was a young man, about twenty-five years of age, of irreproachable manners, and religiouſly mad. He was clad in leather from head to foot, and travelled from one village to another, exclaiming againſt the war and the clergy. Had he confined his invectives to the military only, he would have had nothing to fear; but he inveighed againſt churchmen. Fox was ſeized at Derby, and being carried before a Juſtice of peace, he ſtood with his leathern hat on: upon which an officer gave him a great box on the ear, and cried to him, "You unmannerly raſcal, don't you know you are to appear uncovered before his worſhip?" Fox very deliberately preſents his other cheek to the officer, and begged him to give him another box on the ear for God's ſake. The juſtice would have had him ſworn before he put any queſtions to him; but Fox refuſed, ſaying, "Friend, know that I never ſwear." The juſtice, finding himſelf *thee'd* and *thou'd* by him, and enraged at his inſolence, ordered him

him to the houſe of correction, there to be whipt. Fox returned thanks to the Lord all the way he went to priſon, where the juſtice's orders were executed with great ſeverity. Thoſe who whipt him were greatly ſurpriſed to hear this enthuſiaſt beſeech them to give him a few more laſhes, for the good of his ſoul. Theſe gentlemen did not wait for many intreaties: Mr. Fox had his doſe doubled, for which he thanked them very cordially, and then began to hold forth. At firſt the attendants fell a laughing; but they afterwards liſtened to him: and as enthuſiaſm is a catching diſtemper, many were perſuaded, and thoſe who had ſcourged him became his diſciples. Being afterwards ſet at liberty, he went up and down the country, with a dozen proſelytes at his heels, declaiming againſt the clergy, and receiving flagellations from time to time. One day being ſet in the pillory, he made ſo moving an harangue to the crowd, that fifty of the auditors became his converts; and he won ſo much over the reſt, that they tumultuouſly pulled his head out of the hole and then went in a body to ſearch for the church of England clergyman who had been chiefly inſtrumental in bringing him to this puniſhment, and ſet him on the pillory where Fox had ſtood.

Fox had the boldneſs to make converts of ſome of Oliver Cromwel's ſoldier's, who immediately quitted the ſervice, and refuſed to take the oaths. Oliver, having as great a contempt for a ſect which would not fight, as pope Sixtus V. had for another ſect, *dove non ſi chiavava*, began to perſecute theſe new converts. The priſons were crouded with them; but perſecution ſeldom has any other effect than to increaſe the number of proſelytes. They came forth from their confinement more full of zeal than ever, and followed by their jailors, whom they had likewiſe converted. But what contributed chiefly to the ſpreading of this ſect were the following circumſtances. Fox thought himſelf inſpired, and was therefore of opinion, that he muſt ſpeak in a manner different from the reſt of mankind: upon which he began to writhe his body, to ſcrew up the muſcles of his face, to hold in his breath, and to exhale

exhale it again in a forcible manner, insomuch that the prieſteſs of the Delphic god could not have acted her part to better advantage. Inſpiration ſoon became ſo habitual to him, that he could ſcarce deliver himſelf in any other manner. This was the firſt gift he communicated to his diſciples: theſe copied their maſter cloſely in his grimaces and contortions, and ſhook from head to foot at the inſtant of inſpiration; and from hence they got the name of Quakers. The vulgar, ever the dupes of novelty, amuſed themſelves with mimicking theſe people, trembled, ſpoke through the noſe, quaked, and fancied themſelves inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt. They only wanted a few miracles, and thoſe they wrought.

This new patriarch Fox ſaid one day to a juſtice of peace, before a large aſſembly of people, "Friend, take care what thou do'ſt; God will ſoon puniſh thee for perſecuting his ſaints." This magiſtrate, being one who beſotted himſelf every day with bad beer and brandy, died of an apoplexy two days after, juſt as he had ſigned a *Mittimus* for impriſoning ſome Quakers. The ſudden death of this juſtice was not aſcribed to his intemperance; but was univerſally looked upon as the effect of the holy man's predictions; ſo that this accident made more Quakers than a thouſand ſermons, and as many ſhaking fits, would have done. Cromwel, finding them increaſe daily, was willing to bring them over to his party, and for that purpoſe tried bribery: however, he found them incorruptible, which made him one day declare, that this was the only religion he had ever met with that could reſiſt the charms of gold.

The Quakers ſuffered ſeveral perſecutions under Charles II. not upon a religious account; but for refuſing to pay the tythes, for *theeing* and *thouing* the magiſtrates, and for refuſing to take the oaths enacted by the laws.

At length Robert Barclay, a native of Scotland, preſented to the king, in 1675, his Apology for the Quakers; a work as well drawn up as the ſubject could poſſibly admit. The dedication to Charles II, inſtead of being

being filled with mean flattering encomiums, abounds with bold truths and the wiſeſt counſels. "Thou haſt taſted," ſays he to the king, at the cloſe of his Epiſtle Dedicatory, "of proſperity and adverſity: thou haſt been driven out of the country over which thou now reigneſt, and from the throne on which thou ſitteſt: thou haſt groaned beneath the yoke of oppreſſion; therefore haſt thou reaſon to know how hateful the oppreſſor is, both to God and man. If, after all theſe warnings and advertiſements, thou do'ſt not turn unto the Lord, with all thy heart; but forget him who remembered thee in thy diſtreſs, and give thyſelf up to follow luſt and vanity, ſurely great will be thy guilt, and bittter thy condemnation. Inſtead of liſtening to the flatterers about thee, hearken only to the voice that is within thee, which never flatters. I am thy faithful friend and ſervant, ROBERT BARCLAY."

The moſt ſurpriſing circumſtance is, that this letter though written by an obſcure perſon, was ſo happy in its effects as to put a ſtop to the perſecution.

CON-

CONCLUSION

OF THE

HISTORY of the QUAKEKS.

ABOUT this time appeared the illuſtrious William Pen, who eſtabliſhed the power of the Quakers in America, and would have rendered them reſpectable in the eyes of the Europeans, if mankind could reſpect virtue when appearing in the ſhape of folly. This man was the only ſon of vice-admiral Pen, favourite to the duke of York, afterwards king James II.

William Pen, when only fifteen years of age, chanced to meet a Quaker in Oxford, where he was then following his ſtudies. This Quaker made a proſelyte of him; and our young man, being naturally ſpritely and eloquent, having a very winning aſpect and engaging carriage, ſoon gained over ſome of his companions and intimates, and in a ſhort time formed a ſociety of young Quakers, who met at his houſe; ſo that at the age of ſixteen he found himſelf the head of a ſect. Having left college, at his return home to the vice-admiral his father, inſtead of kneeling to aſk his bleſſing, as is the cuſtom with the Engliſh, he went up to him with his hat on, and accoſted him thus: "Friend, I am glad to ſee thee in good health." The vice-admiral thought his ſon crazy: but ſoon diſcovered he was turned Quaker. He then employed every method that prudence could ſuggeſt, to engage him to behave and act like other people. The youth anſwered his father only with repeated exhortations to turn Quaker alſo. After much altercation, his father confined himſelf to this ſingle requeſt, that he would wait on the king and the duke of York with his hat under his arm, and that he would not *thee* and *thou* them. William anſwered, that his conſcience would not permit him to do theſe things.

things. This exaſperated his father to ſuch a degree, that he turned him out of doors. Young Pen gave God thanks that he permitted him to ſuffer ſo early in his cauſe, and went into the city, where he held forth, and made a great number of converts; and being young, handſome, and a graceful figure, both court and city ladies flocked very devoutly to hear him. The patriarch Fox, hearing of his great reputation, came to London (notwithſtanding the length of the journey) purpoſely to ſee and converſe with him. They both agreed to go upon miſſions into foreign countries; and accordingly they embarked for Holland, after having left a ſufficient number of labourers to take care of the London vineyard.

Their labours met with all the ſucceſs they could wiſh in Amſterdam: but a circumſtance, which reflected the greateſt honour on them, and at the ſame time put their humility to the ſtrongeſt teſt, was the reception they met from the princeſs Palatine, Elizabeth, aunt to George I. of Great Britain, a lady conſpicuous for her genius and knowledge, and to whom Deſcartes had dedicated his Philoſophical Romance.

She was then retired to the Hague, where ſhe received theſe *Friends*; for ſo the Quakers were at that time called in Holland. This princeſs had ſeveral conferences with them: they held ſeveral of their meetings at her houſe, and, if they did not make a perfect convert of her, they at leaſt acknowledged that ſhe was not far from the kingdom of heaven. The Friends ſowed the good ſeed likewiſe in Germany; but had only an indifferent harveſt; for the mode of *theeing* and *thouing* was not reliſhed in a country where every one was obliged to make uſe of Your Highneſs, and Your Excellence. Pen ſoon quitted that country, and returned to England, having received advice his father was ill, to ſee him before he died. The vice-admiral was reconciled to his ſon, and, though of a different perſuaſion, embraced him tenderly. William, in vain, exhorted his father not to receive the ſacrament, and to die a Quaker; and the good old man intreated his ſon

William

William to wear buttons on his ſleeves, and a crape hatband in his beaver; but all to no purpoſe.

William inherited very large poſſeſſions, part of which conſiſted in crown-debts, due to the vice-admiral for ſums he had advanced for the ſea-ſervice. No moneys were at that time leſs ſecure than thoſe owing from the king. Pen was obliged to go, more than once, and *thee* and *thou* Charles and his miniſters, to recover the debt; and at laſt, inſtead of ſpecie, the government inveſted him with the right and ſovereignty of a province of America, to the ſouth of Maryland. Thus was a Quaker raiſed to ſovereign power.

He ſet ſail for his new dominions with two ſhips filled with Quakers, who followed his fortune. The country was then named by them Penſylvania, from William Pen; and he founded Philadelphia, which is now a very flouriſhing city. His firſt care was to make an alliance with his American neighbours; and this is the only treaty between thoſe people and the Chriſtians that was not ratified by an oath, and that was never infringed. The new ſovereign likewiſe enacted ſeveral wiſe and wholſome laws for his colony, which have remained invariably the ſame to this day. The chief is, to ill-treat no perſon on account of religion, and to conſider as brethren all thoſe who believe in one God. He had no ſooner ſettled his government, but ſeveral American merchants came and peopled this colony. The natives of the country, inſtead of flying into the woods, cultivated by degrees a friendſhip with the peaceable Quakers. They loved theſe new ſtrangers as much as they diſliked the other Chriſtians, who had conquered and ravaged America. In a little time theſe ſavages, as they are called, delighted with their new neighbours, flocked in crowds to Pen, to offer themſelves as his vaſſals. It was an uncommon thing to behold a ſovereign *thee'd* and *thou'd* by his ſubjects, and addreſſed by them with their hats on; and no leſs ſingular for a government to be without one prieſt in it; a people without arms, either for offence or preſervation; a body of citizens without any diſtinctions but that of public employments; and for neighbours to live together free from

from envy or jealouſy. In a word, William Pen might, with reaſon, boaſt of having brought down upon earth the Golden Age, which, in all probability, never had any real exiſtence but in his dominions.

Some time afterwards he returned to England, to ſettle ſome affairs relating to his new dominions. King James II. who had loved his father, had the ſame affection for the ſon, and conſidered him rather as a great man than an obſcure ſectary. The king's politics, on this occaſion, agreed with his inclinations. He was deſirous of pleaſing the Quakers, by annulling the laws made againſt Nonconformiſts, in order to have an opportunity, by this general toleration, to introduce the Romiſh religion. All the ſectaries in England ſaw the ſnare that was laid for them, and took care to be upon their guard: they always unite when the Romiſh religion, their common enemy, is to be oppoſed. But Pen did not think himſelf bound, in any manner, to renounce his principles, merely to favour Proteſtants who hated him, in oppoſition to a king who loved him. He had eſtabliſhed liberty of conſcience in his American dominions, and he would not appear to intend to deſtroy it in Europe. He therefore adhered to James, and ſo ſtrictly, that he was generally accuſed of being a Jeſuit. However, the unfortunate king James II. was, like moſt princes of the Stuart family, an odd medley of grandeur and weakneſs; and, like them, always did too much or too little, loſt his kingdom in a manner that could not be accounted for. All the Engliſh ſectaries accepted from William III. and his parliament, the toleration and indulgence which they had refuſed, when offered by king James. It was then the Quakers began to enjoy, by virtue of the laws, the ſeveral privileges they poſſeſs at this time.

Pen, having at length ſeen Quakeriſm firmly eſtabliſhed in his native country, returned back to Penſylvania; where, at his arrival, he was received by his own people and the Americans with tears of joy, as if he had been a father, who was returned to his children after a long abſence. The laws he had enacted had been religiouſly obſerved in his abſence; a circumſtance

ſtance which had happened to no legiſlator but himſelf. After having reſided ſome years in Penſylvania, he quitted it, but with great reluctance, to return to England there to ſolicit ſome matters in favour of the trade of Penſylvania. But he lived not to reviſit it again, being taken off by death in London, *anno* 1718.

It was in the reign of Charles II. that they obtained the noble diſtinction of being exempted from giving their teſtimony on oath in a court of juſtice, and being believed on their bare affirmation. On this occaſion the chancellor, who was a man of wit, ſpoke to them as follows: "Friends, Jupiter one day ordered that all the beaſts of burthen ſhould repair to be ſhoed. The aſſes repreſented, that their laws would not allow them to ſubmit to that operation. Very well, ſaid Jupiter; then you ſhall not be ſhoed; but the firſt falſe ſtep you make, you may depend upon being ſeverely drubbed."

I cannot gueſs what may be the fate of Quakeriſm in America; but I perceive it loſes ground daily in England. In all countries, where the eſtabliſhed religion is of a mild and tolerating nature, it will at length ſwallow up all the reſt. Quakers cannot ſit as repreſentatives in parliament, nor can they enjoy any poſt or office under the government, becauſe an oath muſt be always taken on theſe occaſions, and they never ſwear; ſo that they are reduced to the neceſſity of ſubſiſting by traffick. Their children, when enriched by the induſtry of their parents, become deſirous of enjoying honours, and of wearing buttons and ruffles; are aſhamed of being called Quakers, and become converts to the church of England, merely to be in the faſhion.

OF THE

CHURCH of ENGLAND.

ENGLAND is truly the country of ſectaries, *(in my father's houſe there are many manſions.)* An Engliſhman, in virtue of his liberty, goes to heaven his own way. And yet, notwithſtanding that every one is permitted to ſerve God after his own way, the true religion of the nation, that in which a man makes his fortune, is the ſect of Epiſcopalians, called the Church of England, or ſimply *the Church*, by way of eminence. No one can poſſeſs an employment, either in England or Ireland, unleſs he be ranked among the orthodox, or a member of the church of England, as by law eſtabliſhed. This reaſon (which carries its conviction with it) has operated ſo effectually on the minds of diſſenters of all perſuaſions, that not a twentieth part of the nation is out of the pale of the eſtabliſhed church.

The Engliſh clergy have retained a great number of the ceremonies of the church of Rome; and in particular, that of receiving, with a moſt ſcrupulous exactneſs, their tithes. They have alſo the pious ambition of aiming at ſuperiority; for where's the ſimple curate of a village who would not willingly be pope?

Moreover, they make a religious merit of inſpiring their flock with a holy zeal againſt every one who diſſents from their church. This zeal burnt fiercely under the Tories during the four laſt years of queen Anne's reign; but happily produced no greater miſchief than the breaking the windows of ſome few meeting-houſes: for the rage of religious parties ceaſed in England with the civil wars, and was under queen Anne no more than the murmurings of a ſea, whoſe billows ſtill heaved, after a violent ſtorm. When the Whigs and the Tories laid waſte their native country, in the ſame manner as the Guelphs and Ghibelines formerly did Italy, it was abſolutely

abſolutely neceſſary for both parties to call in religion to their aid. The Tories were for Epiſcopacy, the Whigs for aboliſhing it; but when theſe had got the upper hand, they contented themſelves with only abridging it of its power.

At the time when the earl of Oxford and lord Bolingbroke uſed to drink healths to the Tory cauſe, the church of England conſidered theſe noblemen as defenders of its holy privileges. The lower houſe of convocation, a kind of houſe of commons, compoſed wholly of the clergy, was in ſome credit at that time; at leaſt, the members of it had the liberty to meet, to diſcuſs eccleſiaſtical matters; to ſentence, from time to time, to the flames, all impious books, that is, books written againſt themſelves. The miniſtry, which is compoſed of Whigs at preſent, does not now ſo much as allow theſe gentlemen to aſſemble; ſo that they are at this time reduced (in the obſcurity of their reſpective pariſhes) to the dull occupation of praying for the proſperity of that government, whoſe tranquillity they would not unwillingly diſturb.

With reſpect to the biſhops, who are twenty-ſix in all, they ſtill maintain their ſeats in the houſe of lords in ſpite of the Whigs; becauſe antient cuſtom, or, if you pleaſe, abuſe, of conſidering them as barons, ſtill ſubſiſts. There is a clauſe, however, in the oath they are obliged to take to the government, that puts theſe gentlemen's chriſtian patience to a ſevere trial; namely, that they ſhall be of the church of England, as by law eſtabliſhed. There is hardly a biſhop, dean, or other dignitary, but imagines himſelf ſo *jure divino*; and conſequently it cannot but be a great mortification to them to be obliged to confeſs, that they owe their dignities to a pitiful law made by a ſet of profane laymen. A learned monk (father Courayer) wrote a book, not long ago, to prove the validity and ſucceſſion of Engliſh ordinations. This book was forbid in France: but think you the Engliſh miniſtry were pleaſed with it? No ſuch thing. Thoſe curſed Whigs do not care a ſtraw whether the epiſcopal ſucceſſion among them hath been interrupted or not; or whether biſhop Parker

was

was consecrated in a tavern *, (as some pretend) or in a church, choosing rather that the bishops should derive their authority from the parliament than from the apostles. Lord B—— observed, that the notion of divine right would only serve to make tyrants in lawn sleeves and rochets; but that the law made citizens.

With respect to the morals of the English clergy, they are more regular than those of France, and for this reason: the clergy, in general, are educated in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, at a distance from the depravity and corruption that are found in the capital. They are not called to the dignities of the church till very late, at a time of life when men are sensible of no other passion but avarice, and their ambition wants a supply. Employments are here bestowed, both in church and army, as the rewards for long services only; and there is hardly any instances of boys being made bishops or colonels, immediately upon their leaving school. Besides, most of the clergy are married. The pedantic airs contracted at the university, and the little commerce men of this profession have with the women, commonly oblige a bishop to confine himself to his own. Clergymen sometimes take a cheerful glass at a tavern, because it is the custom so to do; and if they chance to take a cup too much, it is with great sobriety, and without giving the least scandal.

That mixed kind of mortal (not to be defined), who is neither of the clergy nor the laity; in a word, the thing called *abbé* in France, is a species utterly unknown in England. All the clergy here are very much upon the reserve, and most of them pedants. When these are told, that in France young fellows, distinguished for their dissoluteness, and raised to the prelacy by female intrigues, address the Fair publicly in an amorous way, amuse themselves with writing tender songs, entertain their friends splendidly every night at their own houses, and, after the feast is over, withdraw to invoke the assistance of the Holy Spirit, and boldly assume the title

* Alluding to the Nag's Head Consecration.

title of ſucceſſors to the apoſtles; when the Engliſh, I ſay, are told theſe things, they bleſs God that they are Proteſtants. But theſe are ſhameleſs heretics, who deſerve to fry in hell with all the devils, as maſter Rabelais ſays; and, for this reaſon, I ſhall trouble myſelf no more about them.

Of the PRESBYTERIANS.

THE church of England is confined wholly to England and Ireland, Preſbyterianiſm being the eſtabliſhed religion in Scotland. This Preſbyterianiſm is exactly the ſame with Calviniſm, as it was eſtabliſhed in France, and is now profeſſed at Geneva. As the prieſts of this ſect receive but very inconſiderable ſtipends from their churches and, conſequently cannot live in the ſame luxurious manner with biſhops, they very naturally exclaim againſt honours they cannot attain to. Figure to yourſelf the haughty Diogenes trampling under foot the pride of Plato. The Scotch Preſbyterians are not very unlike that proud and beggarly reaſoner. Diogenes did not treat Alexander with half the inſolence as theſe treated King Charles II, for when they took up arms in his cauſe againſt Cromwel, who had deceived them, they compelled that poor prince to undergo the hearing of three or four ſermons every day; would not ſuffer him to play; reduced him to a ſtate of pennace and mortification; inſomuch, that Charles very ſoon grew weary of theſe pedants, and made his eſcape from them with as much joy as a youth does from ſchool.

In preſence of the young, the gay, the ſpritely French graduate, who bawls for a whole morning together in the divinity-ſchool, and makes one at a concert in the evening with the ladies, a church of England clergyman is a Cato. But this Cato is a very Jemmy, when compared with a Scotch Preſbyterian *. The latter affects a ſolemn gait, a ſour countenance, wears a broad-brimmed hat and a long cloak over a ſhort coat, preaches through the noſe, and calls by the name

* With reſpect to the Preſbyterians, times are much altered ſince our author publiſhed this deſcription, which, by the bye, ſeems to have been taken from the Puritans of the laſt century; at leaſt, we do not remember to have ſeen ſuch an animal, with a broad beaver and a ſhort coat, covered with a long cloak.

name of *Whore of Babylon* all churches where the miniſters are ſo fortunate as to enjoy a good five or ſix thouſand a year, and where the people are weak enough to ſuffer this, and give them the titles of My Lord, Your Grace, or Your Eminence. Theſe gentlemen, who have alſo ſome churches in England, have brought an outſide of gravity and auſterity in ſome meaſure into faſhion. To them is owing the ſanctification of Sunday in the three kingdoms. People are forbid to work or take any recreation on that day, which is being twice as ſevere as the Romiſh church. No operas, plays, or concerts, are allowed in London on Sundays; and even cards are ſo expreſsly forbid, that none but perſons of quality, and thoſe we call genteel, play on that day; the reſt of the nation go either to church, to the tavern or to a kept miſtreſs's.

Though the Epiſcopal and Preſbyterian ſects are the two prevailing ones in Great Britain, yet all others are very welcome to come and ſettle in it, and they live very ſociably together, though moſt of their preachers hate one another, almoſt as cordially as a Janſeniſt damns a Jeſuit.

Take a view of the Royal Exchange in London, a place more venerable than many courts of juſtice, where the repreſentatives of all nations meet for the benefit of mankind. There the Jew, the Mahometan, and the Chriſtian tranſact buſineſs together, as though they were all of the ſame religion, and give the name of Infidels to none but bankrupts; there the Preſbyterian confides in the Anabaptiſt, and the Churchman depends on the Quaker's word. At the breaking up of this pacific and free aſſembly, ſome withdraw to the ſynagogue, and, others to take a glaſs. This man goes and is baptized in a great tub, in the name of the father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; that man has his ſon's foreſkin cut off, and cauſes a ſet of Hebrew words (to the meaning of which he himſelf is an utter ſtranger) to be mumbled over the infant; others retire to their churches, and there wait the inſpiration of heaven with their hats on; and all are ſatisfied.

If one religion only were allowed in England, the government would very poſſibly become arbitrary; if there were but two, the people would cut one anothers throats; but, as there are ſuch a multitude, they all live happy, and in peace.

Of the SOCINIANS, or ARIANS, or ANTITRINITARIANS.

THERE is a little ſect here compoſed of clergymen, and a few the moſt learned of the laity, who neither aſſume the name of Arians or Socinians, and yet are directly oppoſite in opinion to St. Athanaſius with regard to the Trinity; not ſcrupling to declare frankly that the Father is greater than the Son.

Do you remember what is related of a certain orthodox biſhop, who, in order to convince an emperor of the reality of conſubſtantiation, put his hand under the chin of the monarch's ſon, and gave him a tweak by the noſe in preſence of his Moſt Sacred Majeſty. The emperor was going to order his attendants to throw the biſhop out of the window, when the good old man gave him this polite and convincing reaſon: "Since "your majeſty, ſays he, is angry when your ſon has "not due reſpect ſhewn him, what puniſhment do "you think will God the Father inflict on thoſe who re-"fuſe his Son Jeſus the titles due to him?" The perſons I am ſpeaking of declare, that the holy biſhop was a raſh old fool; that his argument was by no means concluſive; and that his Imperial Majeſty ſhould have anſwered him in this manner: "Learn that there are "two ways by which men may be wanting in the re-"ſpect they owe to me: firſt, in not doing honour "ſufficient to my ſon; and, ſecondly, in paying him "the ſame honours as to me."

Be this as it will, the principles of Arius began to revive, not only in England, but in Holland and Poland. The celebrated Sir Iſaac Newton honoured this opinion ſo far as to countenance it. This philoſopher thought that the Unitarians argued more mathematically than we do; but the moſt zealous ſtickler for Arianiſm is the illuſtrious Dr. Clark. This man is rigidly virtuous, and of a mild diſpoſition; is more fond of his tenets than deſirous of propagating them; and ſo to-

tally abſorbed in problems and calculations, that he is a mere reaſoning machine. 'Tis he who wrote a book, which is very much eſteemed, and little underſtood, on the Exiſtence of God; and another, more intelligible indeed, but pretty much contemned, on the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion.

He never engaged in thoſe curious ſcholaſtic diſputes which our friend calls *venerable Trifles*. He only publiſhed a work containing all the teſtimonies of the primitive ages, for and againſt the Unitarians, and leaves to the reader the counting of the voices, and the liberty of paſſing ſentence. This book won the doctor a great number of partizans, and loſt him the archbiſhopric of Canterbury; for when Queen Anne was about to beſtow that ſee on him, a reverend doctor, whoſe name was Gibſon, for certain reaſons known to himſelf, and which were doubtleſs very good ones, obſerved to her majeſty, that Dr. Clark was undoubtedly the moſt learned and upright man in the kingdom, and that he wanted only one qualification to be the moſt deſerving object of her majeſty's gracious favour. And pray what is that, doctor? aſked the queen. May it pleaſe your majeſty, to be a Chriſtian, replied the humane and benevolent prieſt. In my opinion, Dr. Clarke was a little out in his calculation; and had better have been an orthodox primate of all England, than a mere Arian curate.

You ſee that opinions are ſubject to as many revolutions as empires. Arianiſm after having triumphed during three centuries, and buried in oblivion for twelve riſes at length out of its own aſhes; but it has choſen a very improper time to make its appearance in, the preſent age being quite cloyed with diſputes and ſects. The members of this ſect are as yet too few to be indulged the liberty of holding public aſſemblies, which, however, they will doubtleſs be permitted to do, in caſe they ſpread conſiderably: but people are now adays ſo cold, with reſpect to all things of this kind, that there is little propability of making a fortune, either in a new religion, or in one revived. Is it not whimſical enough, that Luther, Calvin, and Zwinglius,

lius, whoſe writings no-body now reads, ſhould have founded ſects that are at preſent ſpread over a great part of Europe? That Mahomet, though ſo ignorant, ſhould have given a religion to Aſia and Africa? and that Sir Iſaac Newton, Dr. Clarke, Mr. Locke, Mr. Le Clerc, and others, the greateſt philoſophers, as well as the ableſt writers of their ages, ſhould ſcarce have been able to raiſe a better flock. This it is to be born at a proper period of time. Were cardinal de Retz to return again into the world, he would not draw ten women in Paris after him; were Oliver Cromwel, he who beheaded his ſovereign, and ſeized upon the regal dignity, to riſe from the dead, he would be a wealthy city trader, and nothing more *.

* Probably a Methodiſt haberdaſher.

OF THE PARLIAMENT.

THE members of the Engliſh parliament are fond of comparing themſelves, on all occaſions, to the old Romans.

Not long ſince, Mr. Shippen opened a ſpeech in the in the houſe of communs with theſe words: "The ma-"jeſty of the people of England would be wounded." The ſingularity of this expreſſion occaſioned a loud laugh; but this gentleman, ſo far from being diſconcerted, repeated the ſame words again with a reſolute tone of voice, and the laugh ceaſed, I muſt own, I ſee no reſemblance between the majeſty of the people of England and that of the Romans, and ſtill leſs between the two governments. There is in London a ſenate, ſome of the members whereof are accuſed (doubtleſs very unjuſtly) of ſelling their votes, on certain occaſions, as was done at Rome; and herein lies the whole reſemblance *. In other reſpects the two nations appear to be quite oppoſite in character, with regard both to good and evil. The Romans never knew the terrible madneſs of religious wars. This abomination was reſerved for devout preachers of patience and humility. Marius and Sylla, Cæſar and Pompey, Anthony and Auguſtus, did not draw their ſwords againſt each other to determine whether the Flamen ſhould wear his ſhirt over his robe, or his robe over his ſhirt; or whether the ſacred chickens ſhould both eat and drink, or eat only, in order to take the augury. The Engliſh have formerly deſtroyed one another,

* It would have been no more than juſtice in our author to own, that the people of England reſemble the Romans in their fierce unconquerable ſpirit, in their unquenchable hate of tyrants, and in their invincible paſſion for liberty. With reſpect to religious quarrels, England has been as little harraſſed by them and perhaps not ſo much, as any of her neighbours: nor do we remember one battle ever fought in this kingdom between the Epiſcopalians and Preſbyterians merely on the ſcore of religion.

another, by ſword or halter for diſputes of as trifling a nature. The ſects of the Epiſcopalians and Preſbyterians quite turned the heads of theſe gloomy people for a time: but I believe they will hardly ever be ſo ſilly again, as they ſeem to have grown wiſer at their own expence; and I do not perceive the leaſt inclination in them to murder one another any more for mere ſyllogiſms. But who can anſwer for the follies and prejudices of mankind?

Here follows a more eſſential difference between Rome and England, which throws the advantage entirely on the ſide of the latter; namely, that the civil wars of Rome ended in ſlavery, and thoſe of the Engliſh in liberty. The Engliſh are the only people upon earth who have been able to preſcribe limits to the power of kings by reſiſting them, and who, by a ſeries of ſtruggles, have at length eſtabliſhed that wiſe and happy form of government where the prince is all powerful to do good, and at the ſame time is reſtrained from committing evil: where the nobles are great without inſolence or lordly power, and the people ſhare in the government without confuſion.

The houſe of lords and that of the commons divide the legiſlative power under the king; but the Romans had no ſuch balance *. Their Patricians and Plebeians were continually at variance, without any intermediate power to reconcile them. The Roman ſenate, who were ſo unjuſtly, ſo criminally, formed as to exclude the Plebeians from having any ſhare in the affairs of government, could find no other artifice to effect their deſign, but by employing them in foreign wars. They conſidered the people as a wild beaſt, whom they were to let looſe upon their neighbours, for fear they ſhould turn upon their maſters. Thus the greateſt defects in the government of the Romans was the means of making them conquerors; and, by being unhappy at home, they became maſters of the world, till in the end their diviſions ſunk them into ſlavery.

* This is an imaginary balance; nor do we find from hiſtory, that in any parliamentary conteſt, the king and peers, when joined, were able to counter-balance the power of the commons; yet, while individuals are corruptible, the crown of Britain will always be in poſſeſſion of the means to ſecure a majority.

The govarnment of England from its nature can never attain to ſo exalted a pitch †, nor can it ever have ſo fatal an end. It has not in view the ſplendid folly of making conqueſts, but only to prevent their neighbours from conquering. The Engliſh are not only jealous of their own liberty, but even of that of other nations. The only reaſon of their quarrels with Lewis XIV. was on account of his ambition.

It has not been without ſome difficulty that liberty has been eſtabliſhed in England, and the idol of arbitrary power has been drowned in ſeas of blood; nevertheleſs, the Engliſh do not think they have purchaſed their laws at too high a price. Other nations have ſhed as much blood; but then the blood they ſpilt in defence of their liberty, ſerved only to enſlave them the more.

That which riſes to a revolution in England, is no more than a ſedition in other countries. A city in Spain, in Barbary, or in Turkey, takes up arms in defence of its privileges, when immediately it is ſtormed by mercenary troops, it is puniſhed by executioners, and the reſt of the nation kiſs their chains. The French think that the government of this iſland is more tempeſtuous than the ſeas which ſurround it; in which, indeed, they are not miſtaken: but then this happens only when the king raiſes the ſtorm by attempting to ſeize the ſhip, of which he is only the pilot. The civil wars of France laſted longer, were more cruel, and productive of greater evils, than thoſe of England: but none of theſe civil wars had a wiſe and becoming liberty for their object.

In the deteſtable times of Charles IX. and Henry III. the whole affair was only, whether the people ſhould be ſlaves to the Guiſes. As to the laſt war of Paris, it deſerves only to be hooted at. It makes us think we ſee a crowd of ſchoolboys riſing up in arms againſt their maſter, and afterwards whipped for it. Cardinal de Retz, who was witty and brave, but employed thoſe talents

† The ſucceſs attending the operations of Great Britain in the preſent war, plainly proves, that the government of England is extremely well calculated for conqueſt.

talents badly; who was rebellious without a cauſe, factious without deſign, and the head of a defenceleſs party caballed for the ſake of caballing, and ſeemed to foment the civil war for his own amuſement and paſtime. The parliament did not know what he aimed at, nor what he did not aim at. He levied troops and the next inſtant caſhiered them: he threatened; he begged pardon; he ſet a price on Cardinal Mazarine's head, and afterwards made him his congratulations in a public manner. Our civil wars under Charles VI. were bloody and cruel, thoſe of the League execrable, and that of the Frondeurs * ridiculous.

That for which the French chiefly reproach the Engliſh nation, is the murder of king Charles I. a prince who merited a better fate, and whom his ſubjects treated juſt as he would have treated them, had he been powerful and at eaſe. After all, conſider, on one ſide, Charles I. defeated in a pitched battle, impriſoned, tried, ſentenced to die in Weſtminſter-hall, and then beheaded; and, on the other, the emperor Henry VII. poiſoned by his chaplain in receiving the ſacrament; Henry III. of France ſtabbed by a monk; thirty different plots contrived to aſſaſſinate Henry IV. ſeveral of them put in execution, and the laſt depriving that great monarch of his life. Weigh, I ſay, all theſe wicked attempts, and then judge.

* As this name has occurred frequently in the courſe of this work, eſpecially in the hiſtorical part, it may not be improper to inform the reader, that *Frondeurs*, in its proper ſenſe, ſignifies *Slingers*, and figuratively *cavillers*, or lovers of contradiction; and was a name given to a party that oppoſed the French miniſtry under cardinal Mazarine in 1648.

ON THE

ENGLISH CONSTITUTION.

THIS mixture of different departments in the government of England, this harmony between the king, lords, and commons, has not always ſubſiſted. England was for a long time in a ſtate of ſlavery, having, at different periods, wore the yoke of the Romans, Saxons *, Danes, and, laſt of all, the Normans. William the Conqueror in particular governed them with a rod of iron. He diſpoſed of the goods and lives of his new ſubjects like an eaſtern tyrant: he forbid, under pain of death, any Engliſhman to have either fire or light in his houſe after eight o'clock at night †. Whether it was that he intended by this edict to prevent their holding any aſſemblies in the night, or that, by ſo whimſical a prohibition, he had a mind to try to what a degree of abjectneſs men might be ſubjected by their fellow-creatures. It is, however, certain the Engliſh had parliaments both before and ſince the time of William the Conqueror; they ſtill boaſt of them, as if the aſſemblies which then bore the title of Parliaments, and which were compoſed of the eccleſiaſtical tyrants and of the barons ‡, had been actually the guardians of their liberties, and the preſervers of the public felicity.

Theſe

* The Engliſh were abſolutely free under the Saxon government, to which indeed they owe the beſt privileges they now enjoy.

† The Engliſh doubtleſs complained of this regulation, which, however, was common in all the kingdoms of the continent, where the houſes, being built of wood, were the more ſubject to conflagration.

‡ Our author is here miſtaken. Every free man had a ſeat in the Micklegemot, or great aſſembly of the Saxons, where every law received its final ſanction.

Theſe Barbarians, who poured like a torrent from the ſhores of the Baltic, and over-ran all the eaſt of Europe, brought the uſe of theſe eſtates or parliaments, which are the ſubject of ſo much noiſe, though very little known, along with them. It is true, kings were not then deſpotic, which is preciſely the reaſon why the people groaned under ſo intolerable a yoke. The chiefs of thoſe barbarians, who had ravaged France, Italy, Spain, and England, make themſelves monarchs. Their captains divided and ſhared with them the lands of the conquered: hence thoſe margraves, lairds, barons, with all that gang of petty tyrants who have often diſputed with ſovereigns, who were not firmly fixed on their thrones, the ſpoils and plunder of the people. It was ſo many birds of prey fighting with an eagle, that they might ſuck the blood of the doves; and every nation, inſtead of one good and indulgent maſter, which might have happened to their ſhare, had a hundred of thoſe blood-ſucking monſters. Preſently after prieſt-craft began to mingle in civil matters; from the earlieſt antiquity, the fate of the Gauls, Germans, and inhabitants of Great Britain, depended on the Druids, and on the heads of their villages, an ancient kind of barons, tho' a leſs tyrannical ſort than their predeceſſors. Theſe Druids called themſelves Mediators between Men and the Deity: it was they who made laws, excommunicated, and, laſtly, puniſhed criminals with death. The biſhops ſucceeded by imperceptible degrees to their temporal authority in the Gothic and Vandal government. The popes put themſelves at their head, and with their briefs, bulls, and their other more miſchievous inſtruments, the monks, made kings tremble on their thrones, depoſed or aſſaſſinated them at pleaſure, and, in a word, drew to themſelves all the treaſure of Europe. The weak Ina *, one of the tyrants of the Engliſh heptarchy, was the firſt who, in a pilgrimage whic

* Ina, ſovereign of Eſſex, and afterwards declared monarch of the Anglo Saxons, was the moſt illuſtrious of all the kings who had reigned in this country. He compiled a body of laws, which ſerved as the ground-work of thoſe publiſhed by Alfred.

The

which he made to Rome, ſubmitted to pay *Peter's pence* (about a French crown, or half crown ſterling nearly) for every houſe in his kingdom. The whole iſland preſently followed this example; England became inſenſibly a province of the pope; and the holy father ſent thither, from time to time, his legates to levy extraordinary impoſitions. At laſt John, ſirnamed Sans Terre, or Lack Land, made a formal ceſſion of his kingdom to his holineſs, who had excommunicated him. The barons, who were, by no means, gainers by this proceeding, expelled this wretched prince, and ſet up in his place Lewis VIII. father to St. Lewis king of France; but they were preſently diſguſted with this new monarch, and then compelled him to croſs the ſeas again.

Whilſt the barons, with the biſhops and popes, were tearing all England to pieces, where each of them would fain have ruled, the people, that is to ſay, the moſt numerous, the moſt uſeful, and even the moſt virtuous part of mankind, compoſed of thoſe who addict themſelves to the ſtudy of the laws and of the ſciences, of merchants, mechanics, and, in a word, of labourers, that firſt and moſt deſpiſed of all profeſſions; the people, I ſay, was conſidered by them as animals of a nature inferior to the reſt of the human ſpecies. The commons were then far from enjoying the leaſt ſhare in the government: they were then villains or ſlaves, whoſe labour, and even whoſe blood, was the property of their maſters, who called themſelves the Nobility. Far the greateſt part of the human ſpecies were in Europe, what they ſtill are in ſeveral parts of the world, the ſlaves of ſome lord, and at beſt but a kind of cattle, which they bought and ſold with their lands. It was the work of ages to render juſtice to humanity, and to find out what a horrible thing it was, that the many ſhould ſow whilſt a few did reap: and is it not the greateſt happineſs for the French, that the authority of thoſe petty tyrants has been extinguiſhed by the lawful authority

The only weak part of his character was an unkingly ſpirit of devotion, which prompted him to abdicate the throne: but he was not blameable for the eſtabliſhment of Peter-pence, which was originally no other than an elymoſinary donation for the ſupport of the Engliſh college built by him at Rome.

thority of our ſovereign, and in England by that of the king and nation conjointly?

Happily in thoſe ſhocks which the quarrels of kings and great men gave to empires, the chains of nations have been relaxed more or leſs. Liberty in England has ariſen from the quarrels of tyrants. The barons forced *John Sans Terre* and Henry III. to grant that famous charter, the principal ſcope of which was in fact to make kings dependent on the lords; but, at the ſame time, the reſt of the nation were favoured, that they might ſide with their pretended protectors. This great charter, which is looked upon as the palladium and the conſecrated fountain of the public liberty, is itſelf a proof how little that liberty was underſtood: the very title * ſets it beyond all doubt, that the king thought himſelf abſolute, *de jure*; and that the barons, and even the clergy, forced him to relinquiſh this pretended right, only becauſe they were ſtronger than he. It begins in this manner: "We, of our free will, grant the following privileges to the archbiſhops, biſhops, abbots, priors, and barons of our kingdom, &c." In the articles of this charter there is not one word ſaid of the houſe of commons; a proof that no ſuch houſe then exiſted; or, if it did, that its power was next to nothing. In this the free men of England are ſpecified; a melancholy proof that there were then ſome who were not ſo.

We

* M. de Voltaire ſeems to have conſidered this ſubject ſuperficially. The two great charters were no other than a confirmation and augmentation of thoſe rights and privileges which the Engliſh had enjoyed under the Saxon monarchs; to the maintenance of which, indeed, all the kings ſince the Conqueſt had ſworn, at or after their coronation. The expreſſion of, "we grant of our free will," &c. implies no more than his voluntary compliance with the demands of the barons. They demanded ſuch privileges as their right, and he declared he granted them freely. The moſt eſſential articles of the great charter were theſe: "No freeman ſhall be taken, impriſoned, or diſſeized of his freehold, liberties, or free cuſtoms, but by the lawful judgment of his peers, or by legal proceſs—Amerciaments ſhall be proportioned to the offence and circumſtances of the offender, ſo as not to affect his landed eſtate, or diſable him from following his vocation; but be rated by a verdict of twelve creditable men in the neighbourhood."

We ſee, by the thirty-ſecond article, that thoſe pretended free men owed their lords certain ſervitude. Such a liberty as this ſmelled very rank of ſlavery. By the twenty-firſt article, the king ordains, that from henceforth officers ſhall be reſtrained from forcibly ſeizing the horſes and carriages of free men, except on paying for the ſame. This regulation was conſidered by the people as real liberty, becauſe it deſtroyed a moſt intolerable kind of tyranny. Henry VII. that fortunate conqueror and politician, who pretended to cheriſh the barons, whom he both feared and hated, bethought himſelf of the project of alienating their lands. By this means the villains, who afterwards acquired property by their induſtry, bought the caſtles of the great lords, who had ruined themſelves by their extravagance; and by degrees all the eſtates almoſt in the kingdom changed maſters.

The houſe of commons became every day more powerful; the families of the antient peerage became extinct in time; and as, in the rigour of the law, there is no other nobility in England beſides the peers, the whole order would have been annihilated, had not the kings created new barons from time to time; and this expedient preſerved the body of the peers they had formerly ſo much dreaded, in order to oppoſe the houſe of commons, now grown too powerful. All the new peers, which form the upper houſe, receive nothing beſides their titles from the crown; ſcarce any of them poſſeſſing the lands from whence thoſe titles are derived. The duke of Dorſet, for example, is one of them, though he poſſeſſes not a foot of land in Dorſetſhire; another ſhall be the earl of a village, who hardly knows in what quarter of the iſland ſuch a village lies. They only have a certain power in parliament, and no where out of it, which, with ſome few privileges, is all they enjoy.

Here is no ſuch thing as the diſtinction of high, middle, and low juſtice in France; nor of the right of hunting on the lands of a citizen, who has not the liberty of firing a ſingle ſhot of a muſket on his own eſtate.

A peer

A peer or nobleman in this country pays his ſhare of the taxes as others do, all of which are regulated by the houſe of commons; which houſe, if it is ſecond only in rank, is the firſt in point of credit. The lords and biſhops, it is true, may reject any bill of the commons, when it regards the raiſing of money; but are not entitled to make the ſmalleſt amendment in it: they muſt either paſs it or throw it out, without any reſtriction whatever. When the bill is confirmed by the lords, and approved of by the king, then every perſon is to pay his quota without diſtinction; and that not according to his rank or quality, which would be abſurd, but in proportion to his revenue. Here is no *taille*, or arbitrary poll-tax, but a real tax on lands; all of which underwent an actual valuation under the famous William III. The taxes ſubſiſt always the ſame, notwithſtanding the value of lands has riſen; ſo that no one is ſtripped to the bone, nor of conſequence can there be any ground of complaint: the feet of the peaſant are not tortured with wooden ſhoes; he eats the beſt wheaten bread, is well and warmly cloathed, and is in no apprehenſions on account of the increaſe of his herds and flocks, or terrified into a thatched houſe, inſtead of a convenient ſlated roof, for fear of an augmentation of the *taille* the year following. There are even a number of peaſants, or, if you will, farmers, who have from five to ſix hundred pounds ſterling yearly income, and who are not above cultivating thoſe fields which have enriched them, and where they enjoy the greateſt of all human bleſſings, liberty.

OF THEIR COMMERCE.

NEVER has any people, ſince the fall of Carthage, been, at the ſame time, powerful by ſea and land, till Venice ſhewed the example. The Portugueſe, from their good fortune in diſcovering the paſſage by way of the Cape of Good Hope, have been for ſome time great lords on the coaſts of the Eaſt Indies, but have never been very reſpectable in Europe. Even the United Provinces became warlike, contrary to their natural diſpoſition, and in ſpite of themſelves; and it can in no ſort be aſcribed to their union among themſelves, but to their being united with England, that they have contributed to hold the balance in Europe at the beginning of the ſeventeenth century.

Carthage, Venice, and Amſterdam, were undoubtedly powerful; but their conduct has been exactly like that of merchants grown rich by traffic, who afterwards purchaſe lands with the dignity of lordſhip annexed to them. Neither Carthage, nor Venice, nor Holland have, from a warlike and even conquering beginning, ended in a commercial nation. The Engliſh are the only people exiſting who have done this: they were a long while warriors before they learned to caſt accounts. They were entirely ignorant of numbers, when they won the battles of Agincourt, Creſſy, and Poictiers, and were likewiſe ignorant that it was in their power to become corn-factors and woollen-drapers, two things that would certainly turn to much better account. This ſcience alone has rendered the nation at once populous, wealthy, and powerful. London was a poor country-town when Edward III. conquered one half of France; and it is wholly owing to this that the Engliſh have become merchants; that London exceeds Paris in extent, and number of inhabitants; that they are able to equip and man two hundred ſail of ſhips of war, and keep the kings their allies in pay. The Scotch are a people born warriors, and who, from the

the purity of their air, inherit good ſenſe. Whence comes it then that Scotland, under the name of an *Union*, is become a province to England? It is becauſe Scotland * has ſcarce any other commodity than coal, and that England has fine tin, excellent wool, and abounds in corn, manufactures, and trading companies.

When Lewis XIV. made Italy tremble, and his armies, already in poſſeſſion of Savoy and Piedmont, were on the point of reducing Turin, prince Eugene was obliged to march from the remoteſt parts of Germany to the aſſiſtance of the duke of Savoy. He was in want of money, without which cities can neither be taken nor defended. He had recourſe to the Engliſh merchants. In half an hour's time they lent him five millions, with which he effected the deliverance of Turin, beat the French, and wrote this ſhort note to thoſe who had lent him the money: "Gentlemen, I have received "your money, and flatter myſelf I have employed it to "your ſatisfaction." This gives an Engliſhman a kind of pride, which is extremely well founded, and cauſes him, not without reaſon, to compare himſelf to a citizen of Rome. Thus the younger ſon of a peer of the realm is not above traffic. My lord Townſhend, ſecretary of ſtate, has a brother who is ſatisfied with being a merchant in the city. At the time when my lord Oxford ruled all England, his younger brother was a factor at Aleppo, whence he could never be prevailed on to return, and where he died. This cuſtom, which is now unhappily beginning to be laid aſide, appears monſtrous to a German, whoſe head is full of the coats of

* Scotland is by nature ſurpriſingly adapted to the growth of commerce and manufacture. Beſides coal, her mountains afford inexhauſtible mines of lead, iron, and copper. Her hills and vallies produce excellent paſturage for black cattle and ſheep; her ſoil is capable of raiſing hemp, flax, and corn; her ſeas teem with myriads of fiſh for food and exportation; her coaſt abounds with the beſt harbours in Europe; and her ſituation between the Atlantic and German oceans is peculiarly favourable to foreign trade: her ſubordination to England was the natural conſequence of her adjoining to a more populous, wealthy, induſtrious, and united people.

of arms and pageants of his family. They can never conceive how it is poſſible the ſon of an Engliſh peer ſhould be no more than a rich and powerful citizen, whilſt in Germany they are all princes. I have known above thirty highneſſes of the ſame name, whoſe whole fortunes and eſtate put together amounted to a few coats of arms, and the ſtarving pride they inherited from their anceſtors.

In France every body is a marquis; and a man juſt come from the obſcurity of ſome remote province, with money in his pocket, and a name that ends with an *ac* or an *ille*, may give himſelf airs, and uſurp ſuch phraſes as, *A man of my quality and rank!* and hold merchants in the moſt ſovereign contempt. The merchant again, by dint of hearing his profeſſion deſpiſed on all occaſions, at laſt is fool enough to bluſh at his condition. I will not, however, take upon me to ſay which is the moſt uſeful to his country, and which of the two ought to have the preference; whether the powdered lord, who knows to a minute when the king riſes or goes to a bed, perhaps to ſtool, and who gives himſelf airs of importance in playing the part of a ſlave in the antichamber of ſome miniſter; or the merchant, who enriches his country, and from his counting-houſe ſends his orders into Surat or Cairo, thereby contributing to the happineſs and convenience of human nature.

ON INOCULATION OF THE SMALL-POX.

THE reſt of Europe, that is, the Chriſtian part of it, very gravely aſſert, that the Engliſh are fools and madmen; fools, in communicating the contagion of the ſmall-pox to their children, in order to hinder them from being ſubject to that dangerous and loathſome diſorder; madmen, in wantonly expoſing their children to this peſtilence, with deſign to prevent a contingent evil. The Engliſh, on their ſide, call the reſt of Europe unnatural and cowardly; unnatural, in leaving their children expoſed to almoſt certain death by the ſmall-pox; and cowardly, in fearing to give their children a trifling matter of pain from a purpoſe ſo noble and ſo evidently uſeful. In order to determine which of the two are in the right, I ſhall now relate the hiſtory of this famous practice, which is in France the ſubject of ſo much dread.

The women of Circaſſia have from time immemorial been accuſtomed to give their children the ſmall-pox, even as early as at ſix months old, by making an inciſion in the arm, and afterwards inſerting in this inciſion a puſtule carefully taken from the body of ſome other child. This puſtule ſo inſinuated produces in the body of the patient the ſame effect that leaven does in a piece of dough; that is, it ferments in it, and communicates to the maſs of blood the qualities with which it is impregnated. The puſtules of the child infected in this manner ſerve to convey the ſame diſeaſe to others. This diſorder therefore is perpetually circulating through the different

different parts of Circaſſia; and when, unluckily, there is no infection of the ſmall-pox in the country, it creates the ſame uneaſineſs as a dearth, or an unhealthy ſeaſon, would have occaſioned.

What has given riſe to this cuſtom in Circaſſia, and which is ſo extraordinary to other nations, is, however, a cauſe common to them with all the nations on the face of the earth; that is, the tenderneſs* of mothers, and motives of intereſt. The Circaſſians are poor, but have handſome daughters; which, accordingly, is the principal article of their foreign commerce. It is they who furniſh beauties for the ſeraglios of the grand ſignior, the ſophi of Perſia, and others who are rich enough to purchaſe and to maintain theſe precious commodities. Theſe people bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; that is, in virtuous and honourable principles, which contain the whole ſcience of wheedling the male part of the creation; the art of dancing, with geſtures expreſſive of uncommon effeminacy and laſciviouſneſs; and laſtly, that of rekindling, by the moſt bewitching artifices, the exhauſted appetites of thoſe haughty lords to whom their fates have deſtined them. Theſe poor creatures repeat their leſſon every day with their mothers, in the ſame manner as our girls do their catechiſm; that is, without underſtanding a ſingle ſyllable of what is taught them. Now it often happened, that a father and mother, after having taken an infinite deal of pains in giving their children a good education, are all of a ſudden fruſtrated of their hopes. The ſmall-pox getting into the family, one daughter perhaps died; another loſt an eye; a third recovered, but with a diſfigured noſe; ſo that here was an honeſt couple ruined paſt all remedy. Often too an entire ſtagnation of all kind of commerce has enſued, and that for ſeveral years running, when the diſorder happened to be epidemical, to the no ſmall detriment of the ſeraglios of Turkey and Perſia.

A commercial

* This is a ſtrange effect of maternal tenderneſs, to breed up their children for ſale.

A commercial people are always exceedingly vigilant with regard to their intereſt, and never neglect thoſe pieces of knowledge that may be of uſe in the carrying on their traffic. The Circaſſians found, that upon computation, in a thouſand perſons there were hardly one that was ever twice ſeized with the ſmall-pox completely formed; that there had been inſtances of a perſon's having had a ſlight touch of the ſmall-pox, or ſomething reſembling it, but there never were any two relapſes known to be dangerous: in ſhort, that in fact the ſame perſon has never been known to have been twice infected with this diſorder. They further remark, that when the diſeaſe is mild, and the breaking out has only to pierce through a thin and delicate ſkin, they leave no ſort of mark on the face behind them. From theſe natural obſervations they concluded, that if a child of ſix months or a year old was to have a mild kind of the ſmall-pox, that not only the child would certainly ſurvive, but would get the better of it without ſo much as bearing any marks of it, and would aſſuredly be quit of it during the remainder of its life. From hence it followed of courſe, that their only method would be to communicate the diſorder to their children betimes, which they did, by inſinuating into the child's body a puſtule taken from the body of one infected with the ſmall-pox, the moſt completely formed, and, at the ſame time, the moſt favourable kind that could be found. The experiment could ſcarce poſſibly fail. The Turks *, a very ſenſible people, ſoon adopted this practice; and, at this day, there is ſcarce a baſhaw in Conſtantinople who does inoculate his children while they are at the breaſt.

There are ſome who pretend the Circaſſians formerly learned this cuſtom from the Arabians. We will leave this point in hiſtory to be elucidated by ſome learned Benedictine, who will not fail to compoſe ſeveral volumes in folio upon the ſubject, together with the

* The Turks never adopted the practice of inoculation, if we may depend upon the lateſt and beſt accounts received from Conſtantinople.

the neceſſary vouchers. All I have to ſay of the matter is, that, in the beginning of the reign of George I. Lady Mary Wortley Montague, one of the moſt celebrated ladies in England for her ſtrong and ſolid good ſenſe, happening to be with her huſband at Conſtantinople, reſolved without any kind of difficulty to give the ſmall-pox to a child ſhe had had in that country. In vain did her chaplain remonſtrate that this practice was, by no means, conſiſtent with Chriſtian principles, and could only be expected to ſucceed with infidels; my lady Wortley's ſon recovered, and was preſently as well as could be wiſhed. This lady, on her return to London, communicated the experiment ſhe had made to the princeſs of Wales *, now queen of Great Britain. It muſt be acknowledged that, ſetting crowns and titles aſide, this princeſs is certainly born for the encouragement of arts, and for the good of the human race, to whom ſhe is a generous benefactor: She is an amiable philoſopher ſeated on a throne, who has improved every opportunity of inſtruction, and who has never let ſlip any occaſion of ſhewing her innate generoſity. It is ſhe who on hearing that a daughter of Milton was ſtill living, and in extreme miſery, immediately ſent her a conſiderable preſent; ſhe it is, who encourages the celebrated father Courayer; in a word, it is ſhe who deigned to become the mediatrix between doctor Clarke and Mr. Leibnitz †. As ſoon as ſhe heard of inoculation for the ſmall-pox, ſhe cauſed an experiment of it to be tried on four criminals under ſentence of death, who were thus doubly indebted to her for their lives: for ſhe not only reſcued them from the gallows, but, by means of this artificial kind of the ſmall-pox, prevented them from having it in the natural way, which they, in all human probability, would have had, and of which they might have died in a more advanced age. The princeſs, thus aſſured of the utility of this proof, cauſed her own children to be inoculated.

* The late Queen Caroline.

† Leibnitz attacked the philoſophy of Sir Iſaac Newton, which was defended by Dr. Clarke.

ed. All England, or rather Britain, followed her example; ſo that from that time at leaſt ſix thouſand children ſtand indebted for their lives to Lady Mary Wortley Montague, as do all the fair of the iſland for preſerving their beauty.

In an hundred perſons that come into the world, at leaſt ſixty are found to catch the ſmall-pox; of theſe ſixty, twenty are known to die in the moſt favourable times, and twenty more wear very diſagreeable marks of this cruel diſorder as long as they live. Here is then a fifth part of the human ſpecies aſſuredly killed, or, at leaſt, horribly diſfigured. Among the vaſt numbers inoculated in Great Britain, or in Turkey, none are ever known to die, except ſuch as were in a very ill ſtate of health, or given over before. No one is marked with it, no one is ever infected a ſecond time, ſuppoſing the inoculation to be perfect, that is, to have taken place as it ought. It is therefore certain, that, had ſome French lady imported this ſecret from Conſtantinople into Paris, ſhe would have rendered an ineſtimable and everlaſting piece of ſervice to the nation. The duke de Villequier, father to the preſent duke d'Aumont, a nobleman of the moſt robuſt conſtitution, would not have been cut off in the flower of his age; the prince de Soubiſe, who enjoyed the moſt remarkable ſtate of good health ever known, would not have been carried off at five and twenty; nor would *Monſeigneur*, the grandfather of Lewis XV. been laid in his grave by it in his fiftieth year. The twenty thouſand perſons who died at Paris in 1723, would have been now alive. What ſhall we ſay then? Is it that the French ſet a lower value upon life? or are the ladies of France leſs anxious about the preſervation of their charms? It is true, and it muſt be acknowledged, we are a very odd kind of people! It is poſſible, that in ten years we may think of adopting this Britiſh cuſtom, provided the doctors and curates, allow us this indulgence; or, perhaps, the French will inoculate their children, out of mere whim and maggot,

ſhould

ſhould thoſe iſlanders leave it off, from their natural inconſtancy*.

I learn that the Chineſe have practiſed this cuſtom theſe two hundred years laſt paſt; the example of a nation that has the firſt character in point of natural good ſenſe, as well as of their excellent internal police, is a ſtrong prejudice in its favour. It is true, the Chineſe follow a method peculiar to themſelves; they make no inciſion, but take the ſmall-pox up the noſe in powder, juſt as we do a pinch of ſnuff: this method is more pleaſant, but amounts to much the ſame thing, and ſerves equally to prove, that had inoculation been practiſed in France, it muſt aſſuredly have ſaved the lives of thouſands.

It is ſome years ſince a Jeſuit miſſionary having read this chapter, and being in a province of America, where the ſmall-pox makes horrible ravages, bethought himſelf of cauſing all the Indian children he baptized to be inoculated, ſo that they are indebted to him not only for this preſent life, but alſo for life eternal at the ſame time: what ineſtimable gifts for ſavages!

The biſhop of Worceſter has lately preached up the doctrine of inoculation at London; he has proved, like a good citizen and patriot, what a vaſt number of ſubjects this practice preſerves to a nation; a doctrine which he has alſo inforced by ſuch arguments as might be expected from a paſtor and a Chriſtian. They would preach at Paris againſt this ſalutary invention, as they wrote twenty years ago againſt Sir Iſaac Newton's philoſophy: in ſhort, every thing contributes to prove that the Engliſh are greater philoſophers, and poſſeſſed of more courage than we. It will require a conſiderable ſpace of time before a true ſpirit of reaſon and a particular boldneſs of ſentiment, will be able to make their way over the Straights of Dover.

It muſt not, however, be imagined, that no perſons are to be met with from the Orkneys to the South Foreland but philoſophers; the other ſpecies will always form

* This chapter is taken from a letter written in 1727. The reſt has been added ſince that time.

form the greateſt number. Inoculation was at firſt oppoſed in London; and a great while before the biſhop of Worceſter preached this goſpel from the pulpit, a certain curate had taken it into his head to declaim againſt this practice: he told his congregation, that Job had certainly been inoculated by the devil. This man ſpoiled a good Capuchin, for which nature ſeems to have intended him; he was certainly unworthy the honour of being born in this iſland. So we ſee prejudice, as uſual, firſt got poſſeſſion of the pulpit, and reaſon could not reach it till long after; this is no more than the progreſs of the human mind.

On Chancellor BACON.

IT is not long ſince that ridiculous and threadbare queſtion was agitated in a celebrated aſſembly; who was the greateſt man, whether Cæſar or Alexander, Tamerlane or Cromwel. Somebody made anſwer, that it muſt undoubtedly be Sir Iſaac Newton. This man was certainly in the right; for if true greatneſs conſiſts in having received from heaven the advantage of a ſuperior genius, with the talent of applying it for the intereſt of the poſſeſſor and of mankind, a man like Mr. Newton, and ſuch an one is hardly to be met with in ten centuries, is ſurely by much the greateſt; and thoſe ſtateſmen aud conquerors, which no age has ever been without, are commonly but ſo many illuſtrious villains. It is the man who ſways our minds by the prevalence of reaſon and the native force of truth, not they who reduce mankind to a ſtate of ſlavery by brutiſh force and downright violence; the man, who by the vigour of his mind, is able to penetrate into the hidden ſecrets of nature, and whoſe capacious ſoul can contain the vaſt frame of the univerſe, not thoſe who lay nature waſte, and deſolate the face of the earth, claims our reverence and admiration.

Therefore, as you are deſirous to be informed of the great men that England has produced, I ſhall begin with the Bacons, the Lockes, and the Newtons, &c. The generals and miniſters will come after them in their turn.

I muſt begin with the celebrated baron of Verulam, known to the reſt of Europe by the name of Bacon, who was the ſon of a certain keeper of the ſeals, and was for a conſiderable time chancellor under James I. Notwithſtanding the intrigues and buſtle of a court, and the occupations incident to his office, which would have required his whole attention, he found means to become a great philoſopher, a good hiſtorian, and an elegant writer; and what is yet more wonderful is, that

that he lived in an age where the art of writing was totally unknown, and where ſound philoſophy was ſtill leſs ſo. This perſonage, as is the way amongſt mankind, was more valued after his death than whilſt he lived. His enemies were courtiers reſiding at London, whilſt his admirers conſiſted wholly of foreigners. When the marquis d'Effiat brought the princeſs Mary, daughter to Henry the Great, over to be married to king Charles, this miniſter paid Bacon a viſit, who being then confined to a ſick bed, received him with cloſe curtains. "You are like the angels," ſaid d'Effiat to him; we hear much talk of them, and whilſt every body thinks them ſuperior to men, we are never favoured with a ſight of them."

You have been told in what manner Bacon was accuſed of a crime which is very far from being the ſin of a philoſopher*; of being corrupted by pecuniary gifts; and how he was ſentenced by the houſe of peers to pay a fine of about four hundred thouſand livres of our money, beſides loſing his office of chancellor, and being degraded from the rank and dignity of a peer. At preſent the Engliſh revere his memory to ſuch a degree as, with great difficulty, to allow him to have been in the leaſt guilty. Should you aſk me what I think of it, I will make uſe of a ſaying I heard from Lord Bolingbroke. They happened to be talking of the avarice with which the duke of Marlborough had been taxed, and quoted ſeveral inſtances of it, for the truth of which they appealed to Lord Bolingbroke, who, as being of a contrary party, might perhaps, without any

* Lord Verulam being committed to the Tower, and conſcious of that corruption which was laid to his charge, preſented a petition to the houſe of peers, confeſſing himſelf guilty, and requeſting that he might not be expoſed to the ſhame of a public trial. He was deprived of his office of chancellor; rendered incapable of ſitting in the upper houſe of parliament; fined in forty thouſand pounds; and condemned to be impriſoned in the Tower during the king's pleaſure. James, in conſideration of his great genius, remitted his fine, releaſed him from priſon, and indulged him with a very conſiderable penſion. After all, the crime laid to his charge was rather the effect of weakneſs and inattention, than owing to a vicious heart or ſordid diſpoſition.

treſpaſs againſt the laws of decorum, freely ſay what he thought. "He was," ſaid he, "ſo great a man that I do not recollect whether he had any faults or no." I ſhall therefore confine myſelf to let you know what theſe qualities are which have acquired chancellor Bacon the eſteem of all Europe.

The moſt ſingular, as well as the moſt excellent of all his works, is that which is now the leaſt read, and at the ſame time the moſt uſeful; I mean his *Novum Scientiarum Organum*. This is the ſcaffold by means of which the edifice of the new philoſophy has been reared; ſo that when the building was completed, the ſcaffold was no longer of any uſe. Chancellor Bacon was ſtill unacquainted with nature, but he perfectly knew, and pointed out extraordinary well, all the paths which lead to her receſſes. He had very early deſpiſed what thoſe ſquare-cap'd fools teach in thoſe dungeons called *Colleges*, under the name of philoſophy, and did every thing in his power that thoſe bodies, inſtituted for the cultivation and perfecting the human underſtanding, might ceaſe any longer to mar it, by their *quiddities*, their *horrors of a vacuum*, their *ſubſtantial forms*, with the reſt of that jargon which ignorance and a nonſenſical jumble of religion had conſecrated.

This great man is the father of experimental philoſophy. It is true, wonderful diſcoveries had been made even before his time; the mariner's compaſs, the art of printing, that of engraving, the art of painting in oil, that of making glaſs, with the remarkably advantageous invention of reſtoring in ſome meaſure ſight to the blind; that is, to old men, by means of ſpectacles; the ſecret of making gunpowder, &c. had been already diſcovered. They had gone in ſearch of, diſcovered, and conquered a new world in another hemiſphere. Who would not have thought that theſe ſublime diſcoveries had been made by the greateſt philoſophers, and in times much more enlightened than ours? By no means; for all theſe aſtoniſhing revolutions happened in the ages of ſcholaſtic barbarity. Chance alone has brought forth almoſt all theſe inventions; it is even pretended, that chance has had a great ſhare

in

in the diſcovery of America; at leaſt, it has been believed that Chriſtopher Columbus undertook this voyage on the faith of a captain of a ſhip who had been caſt by a ſtorm on one of the Caribbee iſlands. Be this as it will, men had learned to penetrate to the utmoſt limits of the habitable globe, and to deſtroy the moſt impregnable cities with an artificial thunder, much more terrible than the real; but they were ſtill ignorant of the circulation of the blood, the weight and preſſure of the air, the laws of motion, the doctrine of light and colour, the number of the planets in our ſyſtem, &c. And a man that was capable to maintain a theſis on the *Categories of Ariſtotle*, the *univerſale a parte rei*, or ſuch-like nonſenſe, was conſidered as a prodigy.

The moſt wonderful and uſeful inventions are by no means thoſe which do moſt honour to the human mind. And it is to a certain mechanical inſtinct, which ſubſiſts in almoſt every man, that we owe far the greater part of the arts, and in no manner whatever to philoſophy. The diſcovery of fire, the arts of making bread, of melting and working metals, of building houſes, the invention of the ſhuttle, are infinitely more uſeful than printing and the compaſs; notwithſtanding, all theſe were invented by men who were ſtill in a ſtate of barbarity. What aſtoniſhing things have the Greeks and Romans ſince done in mechanics? Yet men believed, in their time, that the heavens were of chryſtal, and the ſtars were ſo many ſmall lamps, that ſometimes fell into the ſea; and one of their greateſt philoſophers, after many reſearches, had at length diſcovered that the ſtars were ſo many pebbles, that had flown off like ſparks from the earth.

In a word, there was not a man who had any idea of experimental philoſophy before chancellor Bacon; and of an infinity of experiments which have been made ſince his time, there is hardly a ſingle one which has not been pointed out in his book. He had even made a good number of them himſelf. He conſtructed ſeveral ſorts of pneumatical machines, by which he diſcovered the elaſticity of the air; he had long brooded over the diſcovery of its weight, and was even at times

very near catching it, when it was laid hold of by Torricelli. A ſhort time after, experimental phyſics began, at the ſame inſtant, to be cultivated in almoſt all parts of Europe. This was a hidden treaſure of which Bacon had ſome glimmerings, and which all the philoſophers, whom his promiſes had encouraged, made their utmoſt efforts to lay open. We ſee in his book mention made in expreſs terms of that new attraction of which Mr. Newton paſſes for the inventor. "We muſt enquire," ſaid Bacon, "whether there be not a certain magnetical force, which operates reciprocally between the earth and other heavy bodies, between the moon and the ocean, between the planets, &c." In another place he ſays, "Either heavy bodies are impelled towards the center of the earth, or they are mutually attracted by it; in this latter caſe it is evident, that the nearer falling bodies approach the earth, the more forcibly are they attracted by it. We muſt try, continues he, whether the ſame pendulum clock goes faſter on the top of a mountain, or at the bottom of a mine. If the force of the weight diminiſh on the mountain, and increaſe in the mine, it is probable the earth has a real attracting quality."

This precurſor in philoſophy was alſo an elegant writer, an hiſtorian, and a wit. His moral eſſays are in high eſtimation, though they ſeem rather calculated to inſtruct than to pleaſe; and as they are neither a ſatire on human nature, like the maxims of Rochefoucault, nor a ſchool of ſcepticiſm, like Montagne, they are not ſo much read as theſe two ingenious books. His life of Henry VII. paſſed for a maſter-piece; but how is it poſſible ſome people ſhould have been idle enough to compare ſo ſmall a work with the hiſtory of our illuſtrious M. de Thou? Speaking of that famous impoſtor Perkins, ſon of a Jew convert, who aſſumed ſo boldly the name of Richard IV. king of England, being encouraged by the ducheſs of Burgundy, and who diſputed the crown with Henry VII. he expreſſes himſelf in theſe terms: "About this time king Henry was beſet with evil ſpirits, by the witchcraft of the ducheſs of Burgundy, who conjured up from hell the ghoſt of Edward

ward IV. in order to torment king Henry. When the ducheſs of Burgundy had inſtructed Perkins, ſhe began to conſider with herſelf in what region of the heavens ſhe ſhould make this comet ſhine, and reſolved immediately that it ſhould make its appearance in the horizon of Ireland." I think our ſage de Thou ſeldom gives into this gallimaufry, which uſed formerly to paſs for the ſublime, but which at preſent is known by its proper title, the *bombaſt*.

ON LOCKE.

THERE ſurely never was a more ſolid and more methodical underſtanding, nor a more acute and accurate logician than Locke, though he was far from being an excellent mathematician. He never could bring himſelf to undergo the drudgery of calculation, nor the dryneſs of mathematical truths, which offer no ſenſible image to the underſtanding: and no one has more fully evinced than he has done, that a man, without the ſmalleſt aſſiſtance from geometry, might ſtill poſſeſs the moſt geometrical intellect poſſible. The great philoſophers, before his time, had made no difficulties in determining the eſſence or ſubſtance of the human ſoul; but as they were wholly ignorant of the matter, it was but reaſonable they ſhould be all of them of different opinions.

In Greece, which was at once the cradle of arts, and of errors, where the greatneſs and folly of the human mind were puſhed to ſo great a heighth, they reaſoned on the ſoul exactly as we do. The divine Anaxagoras, who had altars erected to him, for teaching men that the ſun was bigger than the Peloponneſus, that ſnow was black, that the ſky was of ſtone, affirmed that the ſoul was an aerial ſpirit, though immortal. Diogenes, a different perſon from him, who became afterwards a Cynic from a counterfeiter of money, aſſerted, that the ſoul was a portion of the ſubſtance of God; a notion which had at leaſt ſomething ſtriking. Epicurus maintains the ſoul is compoſed of parts in the ſame manner as matter. Ariſtotle, whoſe works have been interpreted a thouſand different ways, becauſe they were in fact abſolutely unintelligible, was of opinion, if we may truſt ſome of his diſciples, that the underſtandings of all mankind were but one and the ſame ſubſtance. The divine Plato, maſter to the divine Ariſtotle, and the divine Socrates, maſter to the divine Plato, ſaid, that the ſoul was at the ſame time corporeal and eternal. The

demon

demon of Socrates had, no doubt, let him into the ſecret of this matter. There are actually ſome who pretend, that a fellow, who boaſted of having a familiar, was moſt aſſuredly either knave, or fool; poſſibly they who ſay ſo may be rather too ſqueamiſh.

As for our fathers of the church, ſeveral of them, in the firſt ages, were of opinion that the human ſoul, as well as the angels and God himſelf, were all corporeal. The world is every day improving. St. Bernard, as father Mabillon is forced to own, taught, with reſpect to the ſoul, that after death it did not behold God in heaven, but was obliged to reſt ſatisfied with converſing with the humanity of Jeſus Chriſt. Poſſibly they took it for once on his bare word; though the adventure of the cruſade has ſomewhat leſſened the credit of his oracles. Whole drones of ſchoolmen came after him: there was the irrefragable doctor *, the ſubtil doctor †, the angelic doctor ‡, the ſeraphic doctor §, the cherubimical doctor, all of whom made no ſcruple of ſaying they were perfectly clear as to the ſoul's ſubſtance, but who have, for all that, ſpoken of it exactly as if they neither underſtood one ſyllable of what they ſpoke of, and wanted that nody elſe ſhould. Our Deſcartes, born to diſcover the miſtakes of antiquity, only that he might ſubſtitute his own in their place, and born down by the ſtream of ſyſtem, which hood-winks the greateſt men, imagined he had demonſtrated, that the ſoul was the ſame thing with thought, in the ſame manner as matter is the ſame with extenſion. He firmly maintained, that the ſoul always thinks, and that at its arrival in the body, it is provided with a whole magazine of metaphyſical notions, as of God, ſpace, infinity, and fully ſupplied with all ſorts of abſtract ideas, which it unhappily loſes the moment it comes forth from its mother's womb. Father Mallebranche, of the oratory, in his ſublime illuſions, admits of no ſuch thing as innate ideas, though he made no manner of doubt of our ſeeing every thing in God; and that God himſelf, if it is law-

* Hales. † Scot. ‡ Thomas. § Bonaventure.

ful to ſpeak in this manner, was the very eſſence of our ſoul.

After ſo many ſpeculative gentlemen had formed this romance of the ſoul, one truly wiſeman appeared, who has, in the moſt modeſt manner imaginable, given us its real hiſtory. Mr. Locke has laid open to man the anatomy of his own ſoul, juſt as ſome learned anatomiſt would have done that of the body. He avails himſelf throughout of the help of metaphyſical lights; and altho' he is ſometimes bold enough to ſpeak in a poſitive manner, he is on other occaſions not afraid to diſcover doubts. Inſtead of determining at once what we were entirely ignorant about, he examines, ſtep by ſtep, the objects of human knowledge; he takes a child from the moment of its birth; he accompanies him through all the ſtages of the human underſtanding; he views what he poſſeſſes in common with the brutes, and in what he is ſuperior to them. Above all, he is ſolicitous to examine the internal evidence of conſciouſneſs. "I leave, ſays he, thoſe, who are poſſeſſed of more knowledge than I am, to determine whether our ſouls exiſt before or after the organization of the body; but cannot help acknowledging that the ſoul, that has fallen to my ſhare, is one of thoſe coarſe material kinds of ſouls which cannot always think; and I am even ſo unhappy as not to be able to conceive how it ſhould be more indiſpenſably neceſſary that the ſoul ſhould always think, than it ſhould be that the body ſhould always be in motion."

For my own ſhare, I am proud of the honour of being every whit as ſtupid in this point as Mr. Locke. No body ſhall ever perſuade me that I always think; and I don't find myſelf in the leaſt more diſpoſed than he to think, that a few weeks after I was conceived my ſoul was very learned, and acquainted with a thouſand things that I forgot the moment I came into the world, and that I poſſeſſed to very little good purpoſe in the *uterus*, ſo many valuable ſecrets in philoſophy, all of which abandoned me the inſtant they could have been of any advantage, and which I have never ſince been able to recover.

Locke,

Locke, after demoliſhing the notion of innate ideas; after having renounced the vain opinion that the mind always thinks; having fully eſtabliſhed this point, that the origin of all our ideas is from the ſenſes *; having examined our ſimple and compound ideas; having accompanied the mind in all its operations; having ſhewn the imperfection of all the languages ſpoken by men, and what a groſs abuſe of terms we are every moment guilty of; Locke, I ſay, at length proceeds to conſider the extent, or rather the nothingneſs, of human knowledge. This is the chapter in which he has the boldneſs to advance, though in a modeſt manner, "That we ſhall never be able to determine, whether a being, purely material, is capable of thought or no?" This ſagacious propoſition has paſſed with more than one divine as a ſcandalous aſſertion, that the ſoul is material and mortal. Some Engliſh devotees as uſual gave the alarm. The ſuperſtitious are in ſociety what poltroons are in an army; they infect the reſt with their own panics. They cried out, that Mr. Locke wanted to turn all religion topſy-turvy: there was, however, not the ſmalleſt relation to religion in the affair, the queſtion was purely philoſophical, and altogether independent of faith and revelation. They had only to examine, without rancour, whether it were a contradiction to ſay, that "matter is incapable of thought," and, "God is able to endow matter with thought." But it is too frequent with theologians to begin with pronouncing that God is offended, whenever we are not of their ſide of the queſtion, or happen not to think as they do: the caſe is pretty much like that of the bad poets, who took it into their heads to imagine Boileau ſpoke high-treaſon, when he was only laughing at the ſillineſs of their wretched compoſitions. Doctor Stillingfleet has acquired the character of a moderate divine, only becauſe he has refrained from abuſe in his controverſy with Mr. Locke. He ventured to enter the liſts with

* This is expreſsly the doctrine of Ariſtotle. The ſoul has no knowledge but that which ſhe acquires through the canal of the nſes.

with him, but was vanquiſhed, becauſe he reaſoned too much like doctor; whilſt Locke, like a true philoſopher fully acquainted with the ſtrength and weakneſs of human underſtanding, fought with arms of whoſe temper he was perfectly well aſſured.

ON THE SOUL.

LET us ſuppoſe a dozen philoſophers in an iſland, where they never ſaw any thing beſides the vegetable world. Such an iſland, and eſpecially half a ſcore or a dozen good philoſophers, are, 'tis true, no eaſy matter to be met with; but however we may very well imagine them, and therefore the hypotheſis is allowable. They admire that life which circulates through the the pores and fibres of plants, which ſeems ſometimes to be annihilated, and at others to revive again: and not being over and above well informed of the generation of plants, or in what manner they receive their growth and nouriſhment, they therefore call this the vegetative ſoul. What do you mean by the term *vegetative ſoul?* will ſome one aſk. It is, anſwer they, a word we make uſe of to ſignify that unknown ſpring by which all theſe operations are performed. But, ſays ſome mechanic, do you not ſee all this is done in a natural way, by means of weights, levers, wheels, and pulleys? No, ſay our philoſophers by no means. There is ſomething more in this ſort of vegetation than mere matter and motion; there is beſides a ſecret power with which all plants are endowed, by which they admit the ſap that is neceſſary for their nouriſhment; and this power, which cannot poſſibly be explained by any laws of mechaniſm, is a gift which God has beſtowed on matter, and whereof neither you nor I can comprehend the return.

After a good deal of wrangling, at length our philoſophers diſcover the animals. Aha! ſay they, after a long ſcrutiny, here are beings organized exactly as we are! They have certainly the gift of memory, and that frequently in a degree ſuperior to ourſelves. They have the ſame paſſions too; they have knowledge or conſciouſneſs; they communicate their wants; and perpetuate their ſpecies exactly in the ſame manner, and at well as the beſt metaphyſician of us all could have done.

They

They proceed to the diſſection of one of theſe beings, in which they find a heart and a brain. What! ſay they, is it poſſible the author of theſe machines, who makes nothing in vain, ſhould have given them all the organs of ſenſation, merely to prevent their being in the leaſt capable of ſenſation? The thought teems with abſurdity. There is therefore moſt aſſuredly ſome attribute within them, which is properly what we call *Soul*, for want of a better word; ſomething which is capable of perception, and which is provided with a certain ſtock of ideas. The queſtion is, what this thinking principle is? Can it be ſomething entirely different from matter? Is it a pure unmixed ſpirit? or ſhall we ſay, it is a being of a middle nature between that matter, whoſe properties we know not in any degree, and pure ſpirit, about which we are at leaſt as much in the dark? or ſhall it be a property with which God endowed organized matter?

Then they fall to making experiments on inſects, as on earth-worms, or the polypus; they cut them into ſeveral portions, and are aſtoniſhed, after ſome little time, to ſee new heads grow out of each ſingle part; the ſame animal re-produces itſelf, and draws from its very deſtruction the means of multiplying its ſpecies. Has it ſeveral ſouls, which wait to animate theſe parts ſo reproduced, when the head ſhall have been ſevered from the original trunk? They reſemble the trees which ſhoot out branches, and which reproduce their like from their wounds; Can theſe trees have ſeveral ſouls too? This is by no means likely; it is therefore probable the ſouls of theſe beaſts are of another ſpecies than that to which we gave the name of *vegetative ſoul* in plants; it muſt therefore be a ſuperior faculty, with which God has deſigned to animate certain portions of matter; it is a new proof of his power, and affords new matter of adoration.

Some perſon equally overbearing and falſe in his reaſonings, happens to hear this diſcourſe, and ſays, You are a ſet of impious wretches, whoſe bodies ought to be burned, for the good of your ſouls, for denying man's immortality. Our philoſophers are ſtruck with ſuch unheard

unheard of language, and look at one another in amazement; one of them anſwers in a mild and placid tone of voice, Why in ſuch haſte to burn us? What reaſon can you have to think that we hold that cruel ſoul of yours to be mortal? Becauſe you believe, replies the other, that God has given theſe brutes, who are organized as we are, the faculty of forming ideas and ſentiment. Now know that the ſouls of brutes periſh with them; therefore you muſt certainly hold that the ſouls of men periſh alſo.

The philoſopher anſwers, We are far from pretending to any certainty that what we call *ſoul* in the brutes periſhes with them; we are well aſſured matter never periſhes at all; and we are of opinion, it is poſſible God may have endowed animals with ſomewhat that may retain to all eternity, if God ſo pleaſe, the faculty of of forming ideas. We are very far from aſſerting, that the thing is really and certainly ſo; it belongs not to man to be ſo confident of himſelf; but we dare not ſet bounds to the power of the Deity. We ſay it is extremely probable that the brutes, which are mere matter, may have received from him a certain portion of intelligence. We diſcover daily certain properties of matter; that is to ſay, ſo many gifts of the Deity, whereof we had here before no manner of conception, We at firſt defined matter to be an extended ſubſtance. afterwards we diſcovered we ought to have added ſolidity; ſome time after we knew that this matter had a certain power, or force, which is called *inert force*, or *vis inertiæ*; after which again we were quite aſtoniſhed, to be reduced to the neceſſity of acknowledging that matter gravitates.

Upon our attempting to puſh our enquiries ſtill farther, we were forced to own there were beings reſembling matter in ſome points, but which are likewiſe without certain attributes with which matter is ſometimes endowed. The elementary fire, for inſtance, acts on our ſenſes as well as other bodies, yet it tends not to one common centre as they do; on the contrary, it diverges from the centre in ſtraight lines towards all ſides. It appears contradictory to all the laws of attraction

tion and gravity, to which the other parts of matter are ſubject.* Optics has myſteries altogether unaccountable, and for which it is impoſſible to aſſign any reaſon, but by hazarding the ſuppoſition that the rays of light penetrate each other. There is undoubtedly ſome property in light, which diſtinguiſhes it from all the other known parts of matter: it would ſeem that light is a middle kind of ſubſtance between bodies and the other kinds of beings, of which we are entirely ignorant. It is very probable, that thoſe other ſpecies of matter are themſelves a certain middle rank which leads to other creatures, that there may be, in this manner, a chain of ſubſtances which riſe to infinity.

Uſque adeo quod tangit idem eſt, tamen ultima diſtant.

This idea ſeems to us worthy of the greatneſs of God, if any ever was or can be ſo. Amongſt theſe ſubſtances he might no doubt have choſen one, in order to place it in our body, and which is known by the name of the Human Soul; the ſacred books, which we have read, tell us this ſoul is immortal. Reaſon in this point agrees with revelation; for how is it poſſible any ſubſtance ſhould periſh? And if all nature is deſtroyed, yet being muſt ever exiſt. We cannot conceive ſuch a thing as the creation of a ſubſtance: and it is equally impoſſible for us to form any idea of its annihilation. But we dare not venture to aſſert, that the Sovereign Lord of all things may not alſo have given ſentiment and perception to the being called matter. You are perfectly ſure the eſſence of your ſoul is thought, which is what we are by no means ſo poſitive of; for on examining a fœtus, we are at a loſs to imagine its head can poſſibly be ſo well ſtored with ideas, and are quite dubious, that in the caſes of a deep and perfect ſleep, or in a complete lethargy, there is any ſuch thing as meditation. Thus it appears to us, that thought may be, not the eſſence of the thinking ſubſtance, but a gift which the Creator may have given thoſe we call thinking beings. All this has created in us a doubt,

that,

that, were he ſo pleaſed, he might endow a ſingle atom with this faculty, and preſerve this atom to eternity, together with this gift, ordering both or either at his pleaſure. There is leſs difficulty in conceiving how matter may be rendered capable of thinking, than to divine how any ſubſtance whatever ſhould think. You have no ideas, only becauſe it was the will of God you ſhould enjoy this faculty; why then would you hinder him from beſtowing this quality on other ſpecies of beings? Can you be daring enough to believe that your ſoul is exactly of the ſame ſubſtance with thoſe beings which approach neareſt to the Deity? There is abundance of reaſon to think them of a very ſuperior order; and that conſequently God hath deſigned to endue them with a faculty of thinking infinitely ſuperior and more beautiful, in the ſame manner as he has granted a very moderate meaſure of ideas to brute animals, which are of an order inferior to you. I am utterly ignorant how I live, or how I beſtow life, and you require me to comprehend how I come hy ideas: the ſoul is as it were a clock which God has given us to regulate, but without telling us of what ſort of ſubſtance the main ſpring of it is formed.

Is there any any thing in all this from whence it can be inferred that our ſouls are mortal? Nay, further, we think as you do with reſpect to that immortality which the goſpel announces; but at the ſame time we hold ourſelves too ignorant to be able to affirm, that God has not power to beſtow thought on whatever being he pleaſes. You ſet bounds to the power of the Creator, which is beyond all bounds, and we ſtretch it as far as his exiſtence. You will forgive us if we hold him Almighty, as we forgive you the having reſtrained his power. You are certainly well informed of what he is capable of doing, whilſt we pretend to know nothing of the matter. Let us therefore live in peace like brothers who adore one common father; you as becomes people poſſeſſed of ſouls at once bold and well-informed; and we like ignorant and cowardly ſpirits, as we certainly are. We have both but a ſpan

of

of exiſtence to enjoy. Let us then enjoy it in peace without falling together by the ears for quibbles, and knotty queſtions, which will be better reſolved on our entering that boundleſs ocean of eternity which begins the moment our glaſs is entirely ſpent.

ON TOLERATION;

And on the Maxim, That it is impoſſible PHILOSOPHERS ſhould be of Prejudice to Human Society.

THIS brutal perſon unable to make a ſatisfactory reply, talked for a long time, and with great heat. Our poor philoſophers in the mean while applied themſelves to reading hiſtory, and after much ſtudy declared to the barbarian, That he was unworthy to poſſeſs an immortal ſoul.

Friend, we read that throughout all antiquity matters went altogether as well as in our times; that there were even greater virtues, and that philoſophers were never perſecuted for matters of mere opinion; why then would you puniſh us for opinions we never held, and which have no exiſtence but in your own diſtempered brain? We read that all antiquity believed matter to be eternal. Even thoſe who diſcovered it to have been created, let others enjoy their opinions in peace. Pythagoras had been a cock, and his parents hogs: nobody had any thing to ſay againſt it, whilſt his ſect was loved and revered by all mankind, except by cooks, and thoſe who had any beans to diſpoſe of.

The Stoics acknowledged God much ſuch another Deity as has been ſo raſhly abandoned by the Spinoſiſts *; yet the Stoics was the ſect of all others that abounded moſt in heroic virtues, and enjoyed the greateſt degree of credit amongſt mankind.

The

* The famous Spinoza, the ſon of a Portugueſe Jew, was born at Amſterdam in the laſt century, and has been branded as an athieſt for maintaining that the whole univerſe, and all it contains, belongs eſſentially to the nature of God, conſidered as one only ſubſtance, of which thought and infinite extent are no more than the properties.

The Epicureans made their gods reſemble our canons, who maintain their *divine right* by a luxurious indolence, ſipping their nectar and ambroſia in perfect peace, and giving themſelves no ſort of trouble how the world went. Theſe Epicureans boldly taught the materiality and mortality of the ſoul. They were not the leſs regarded on that account. They were admitted into all offices of truſt or honour, and yet their jumble of atoms did not occaſion the leaſt diſorder in the world.

The Platoniſts, like the Gymnoſophiſts, did not do us the honour to think ſuch a being as God ever deigned to create us with his own hands. He had, according to them, left this ſervile office to ſubalterns called Genii, who committed a thouſand diſorders and blunders in the exerciſe of their function. The god of the Platoniſts was an excellent workman, who employed but bungling apprentices in his work here below. Yet men were not wanting in their reſpect for the ſchool of Plato.

In a word, both with Greeks and Romans, ſo many ſects, ſo many different modes or ways there were of thinking about the Deity, the ſoul, the paſt, and the future; yet none of all theſe ſects were ever perſecuted. They were all miſtaken, a circumſtance we are exceedingly ſorry for; yet were they all peaceable and quiet, which confounds and amazes, becauſe it condemns us, by ſhewing, that moſt of the reaſoners of this day are monſters, whilſt thoſe of antiquity were no other than human beings. They ſung publicly on the ſtage at Rome, *Poſt mortem nihil eſt; ipſaque mors nihil.* "There is nothing after death; and death itſelf is but nothing." Theſe ſentiments rendered them neither better nor worſe; and the world was as eaſily and as well governed as before; whilſt a Titus, a Trajan, and a Marcus Aurelius ſwayed the world, like ſo many beneficent deities.

If we paſs from the Greeks and Romans to the barbarous nations, let us ſtop a while amongſt the Jews. Superſtitious, cruel, and ignorant as this wretched people certainly were, yet they honoured the Phariſees, who admitted the fatality of deſtiny, and the metempſichoſis,

ſichoſis. They alſo reſpected the Sadducees, who abſolutely denied the immortality of the ſoul, together with the exiſtence of any manner of ſpirits, founding their dogmas on the law of Moſes, which never makes the leaſt mention either of rewards or puniſhments after this life. The Eſſenians, who held the opinion of fatality too, and who never offered up any kind of victim in the temple, were ſtill more revered than the Phariſees and the Sadducees: yet did none of their opinions occaſion the leaſt diſturbance in government. There was reaſon, however, ſufficient to promote cutting of one another's throats, burning and exterminating each other by turns, had they had the leaſt inclination to divert themſelves that way. O wretched mortals! profit by theſe examples. Think for yourſelves, and let others enjoy the privilege to do ſo too. It is the ſole conſolation of weak minds in this ſhort and tranſitory life of ours. What! ſhall you receive with politeneſs a Turk, who believes Mahomet made a voyage to the moon? You would be very careful how you would have diſobliged the baſhaw Bonneval, yet would you cut your brother Chriſtian to pieces, becauſe he believes God is able to have beſtowed intelligence and thought on every creature.

In this manner ſpoke one of thoſe philoſophers: a ſecond added; "Believe me, we ought never to admit ſuch a thought as that any philoſophical notion is capable of hurting the eſtabliſhed religion of a country. Although our myſteries contradict our demonſtration; yet they are not a whit the leſs revered by our chriſtian philoſophers, who know that the objects of faith and of reaſon are of a very oppoſite nature. Never will philoſophers be the founders of any religious ſect: Why? Becauſe they are without the leaven of enthuſiaſm. Divide the human race into twenty parts; nineteen are compoſed of ſuch perſons, who maintain themſelves by the labour of their hands, and who will hardly know that ſuch men as Locke and Newton ever exiſted. In the remaining twentieth part, how few ſhall we find who read? And, even of thoſe who do twenty are readers of romances, for one that ſtudies philoſophy.

The

The number of thoſe who ſtudy is infinitely ſmall, and thoſe few will never think of diſturbing the peace of mankind.

Who are they who have brought the flame of diſcord into their country? Was it Pomponacius Montagne, le Vayer, Deſcartes, Gaſſendi, Bayle, Spinoſa, Hobbes, lord Shaftſbury, the count de Boulainvilliers, the conſul Maillet, Toland, Collins, Fludd, Woolſton, Becker, the author who diſguiſes himſelf under the feigned name of James Maſſey, the writer of the Turkiſh Spy, of the Jewiſh Letters, of the Perſian Letters, of the Penſée Philoſophiques, &c.? By no means: they were generally theologians, who, being at firſt actuated with the ambition of becoming heads of ſects, had ſoon afterwards adopted that of being chiefs of a party. What do I ſay? All the books of modern philoſophy put together could not have made ſuch a diſturbance as the diſpute of the Cordeliers formerly did, to determine the orthodox form of their ſleeves and cowls.

ON

ON

DESCARTES and NEWTON.

A Frenchman, on his arrival in London, finds a total change in philoſophy, as in every thing elſe. He has juſt left the world, which abhors a *vacuum*, for one full of emptineſs. At Paris we ſee a world compoſed of vortices of a ſubtile matter; at London there is no ſuch thing in nature. With you, it is the preſſure of the moon that occaſions the flux and reflux of the ſea: amongſt the Engliſh, it is the ſea which gravitates towards the moon; ſo that, when you think the moon ought to give us high water, theſe philoſophers hold we ought to have quite the contrary, or low water. Unhappily for us, there is no coming at the truth * of this, except one had been able to examine the moon and the tides at the firſt moment of their creation. You will farther remark, that the ſun, which in France paſſed for a mere cypher in this affair, clubs in this country for a fourth part of the reckoning. Amongſt your Carteſians, every thing is performed by means of a certain impulſe, that is paſt all underſtanding: according to Mr. Newton, it is done by means of attraction, the cauſe of which is altogether as great a ſecret. At Paris, you figure to yourſelves the earth much like a melon; at London, it is flattened on both ſides †. Light, with

* It is not a very eaſy matter to underſtand our author's meaning in this paragraph. The greateſt difficulty about the tides was that of accounting for their riſing equally high, or nearly ſo, at the ſame time, on both ſides of the earth, which could not poſſibly be affected equally by the attraction of the moon. But this difficulty is removed by the ingenuity of Mr. Ferguſon, who proves, by experiment, that the centrifugal force of the ſide of the earth furtheſt from the moon, overbalances her attraction nearly at much as her attraction on the ſide next her overballances the centrifugal force of that ſide.

† That the earth is an oblate ſpheroid is now well known, and univerſally acknowledged.

with a Carteſian, exiſts in the air; according to a Newtonian, it travels to us from the ſun, and is about ſix minutes and an half in its paſſage. Your chymiſtry performs all its operations by means of acids and alkalies, and a certain portion of ſubtile matter; in the Engliſh chymiſtry it is attraction which predominates.

Even the eſſence of things has undergone a total change. You agree neither about the definition of the ſoul, nor that of matter. Deſcartes aſſerts the ſoul to be the very ſame individual ſubſtance with thought; whilſt Mr. Locke ſhews the contrary, with all the eaſe and perſpicuity imaginable. Deſcartes maintains, that matter is nothing but extenſion; Newton muſt needs add ſolidity. Here are terrible contradictions truly!

Non noſtrum inter vos tantas componere lites.

This famous Newton, the deſtroyer of the Carteſian ſyſtem, died in the month of March of the year 1727. He lived honoured by his countrymen, and has been venerated as a king who had been a benefactor to his people. He has been read with extreme avidity; and the elogium of Newton, pronounced by Fontenelle in the Academy of Sciences, has been tranſlated into Engliſh. They expected alſo his judgment, as a ſolemn declaration of the ſuperiority of the Engliſh philoſophy. But on finding he not only deceived them in giving an account of this philoſophy, but even that he compared Deſcartes with Newton, the whole Royal Society of London roſe up in arms; and, far from acquieſcing in his determination, they were very ſevere in their criticiſm on that piece. There were even ſome (and theſe not the greateſt philoſophers among them) who were ſhocked at the compariſon, for no other reaſon than that Deſcartes was a Frenchman.

It muſt be acknowledged theſe two philoſophers purſued a very different conduct, as well in regard to their fortune and way of life as their philoſophy. Deſcartes was born with a ſtrong and lively imagination, which rendered him extremely ſingular in his private conduct of life, as well as in his method of reaſoning. His

fancy

fancy could not be reſtrained even in his philoſophical works, in which we are conſtantly meeting with ingenious and lively turns of thought. Nature had almoſt made him a poet; and he actually compoſed for the queen of Sweden an entertainment in verſe, which, for the honour of his memory, has not been printed. He followed for ſome time the profeſſion of arms; and then, all of a ſudden turning philoſopher, at length he thought fit, in ſpite of the gravity of his character, to fall in love. He had by his miſtreſs a daughter called Francine, who died young, to the great regret of the father. Thus he experienced all the different viciſſitudes incident to human life.

He was for a great while of opinion, that, in order to philoſophize in full liberty, it was neceſſary to fly the ſociety of men, and eſpecially to quit his country. He was certainly in the right, his contemporaries being utterly incapable of giving him any aſſiſtance, and more likely to do him prejudice than be of any kind of advantage to him. He quitted France, therefore, in queſt of truth, which was then perſecuted on all ſides by the wretched philoſophy of the ſchools; but he found reaſon to the full as little encouraged in the univerſities of Holland, whither he retired: for whilſt they condemned in France only ſuch propoſitions in his philoſophy as were true, he was equally perſecuted by the philoſophers in Holland, who did not underſtand it more than the former; and who, as they beheld his credit from a nearer point of view, for that very reaſon hated his perſon more: he was therefore obliged to leave Utrecht. He underwent the accuſation of atheiſm, the laſt reſource of calumny; and the man who had employed all the efforts of his natural ſagacity to find out new proofs of the being of a God, was accuſed of denying his exiſtence. So many perſecutions neceſſarily ſuppoſed an extraordinary ſhare of merit and reputation: and he was well known to enjoy a great ſhare of both. Reaſon began to make ſome ſmall progreſs in the world, and to penetrate the fogs and darkneſs of the ſchools, as well as to thin the mazes of popular prejudices. His name, at length, made ſuch a noiſe, that it was pro-

poſed to engage him to return into France, by rewarding him according to his merit. He was offered a penſion of a thouſand crowns. In hopes of this, he actually returned, payed the charge of the patent, was diſappointed of his penſion, and went back to philoſophize in the ſolitudes of North Holland; whilſt the great Galileo, at the age of fourſcore, groaned away his days in the dungeons of the Inquiſition, becauſe he had demonſtrated, by irrefragable proofs, the motion of the earth. At length our philoſopher ended his life ſuddenly at Stockholm, his premature death being occaſioned by a bad regimen, in the preſence of ſome of the learned, who were his enemies, and in the management of certain phyſicians, who bore him a mortal antipathy.

The career of Sir Iſaac Newton was intirely different from his: his life, which laſted till near fourſcore, was attended throughout with a happy tranquillity, honoured and eſteemed by his country. It was his great good fortune not only to be born in a free country, but in an age too in which all the fooleries of the ſchools had been baniſhed, and reaſon alone was cultivated: thus mankind were more diſpoſed to become his ſcholars than his enemies.

There is one very ſingular difference between his fortune and that of Deſcartes; which is this, that, in the courſe of ſo long a life, he was intirely free from the tyranny of paſſion, as he was from any kind of failing. He never had the leaſt commerce with any woman; a circumſtance of which I have been aſſured by the phyſician and ſurgeon in whoſe hands he died: in this we ought certainly to admire Newton, yet without blaming a contrary conduct in Deſcartes.

The public opinion in England, with regard to the two philoſophers we are now ſpeaking of, is, that the former was properly no more than a dreamer, whilſt the other was a true ſage. There are very few in London who read Deſcartes, whoſe works are, in effect, grown perfectly uſeleſs: there are alſo few who read Newton; but this is owing to its requiring much learning to be able to comprehend him. Yet every body talks of them; and whilſt the Frenchman ſtands excluded

cluded from any kind of reſpect or admiration, no praiſes are thought too high for the merit of the Engliſh philoſopher. Some folks imagine, that the exploding that odd notion of the horrors of a *vacuum*, the diſcovery of the weight and ſpring of the atmoſphere, and the invention of teleſcopes, are all of them owing to the ſagacity of Newton: in ſhort, he is in this country a ſecond fabulous Hercules, to whoſe ſingle valour the ignorant have aſcribed the exploits of all the others.

In a critique publiſhed in London on Fontenelle's diſcourſe, they have the boldneſs to aſſert, that Deſcartes is no geometrician. Thoſe who talk in this manner may be juſtly accuſed of turning againſt their benefactor. Deſcartes has made full as great a progreſs, from the point in which he found geometry to that to which he has carried it, as Newton has done after him. He is the firſt who taught the manner of finding the algebraic equation of curves. His geometry, which has, thanks to him for it, become ſo common ſince his time, was then thought ſo very deep, that no profeſſor would take upon him to explain it; and there was no one in France, but Fermat, or in all the United Provinces, beſides Schouten, who underſtood it. He carried this geometrical and inventive genius with him into the ſtudy of dioptrics, which became an art intirely new in his hands; and if he has made conſiderable miſtakes, it is becauſe they who diſcover new countries cannot be ſuppoſed, at the firſt, to be alike thoroughly acquainted with every part of it. They who have followed him in it, owe him at leaſt the obligation of the diſcovery. At the ſame time, I am far from aſſerting that there are not abundance of miſtakes in Deſcartes.

Geometry was a guide, which he had formed in ſome meaſure himſelf, and which would have conducted him with great certainty in his reſearches in phyſics: but at laſt, abandoning this guide, he was bewildered in the mazes of ſyſtem, which he adopted. From this time forwards his philoſophy became no other than an ingenious romance, and, at beſt, probable only in the eyes of thoſe ignorant philoſophers who were his contemporaries. He was miſtaken with reſpect to the ſoul, the

laws of motion, and the doctrine of light and colour. He admitted innate ideas, invented new elements, created a world, and made man after his own fancy; so that it was said, with great justice, that man, as made by Descartes, was a perfect original, wholly different from that formed by God Almighty. He carried his metaphysical mistakes so very far as to pretend that two and two make four, because it was the will and pleasure of God it should be so; but I think I need hardly fear the imputation of partiality in saying, that his very wanderings have somewhat amiable. It is true, he was deceived; but it was, at least, according to method, and his errors were the fruit of consequences very justly drawn from their premises. If he invented new chimeras in physics, we must at the same time acknowledge that he destroyed the antient ones, and that he taught his contemporaries to reason, and even to fight him at his own weapons. In short, if he has not always paid in sterling coin, we owe him the obligation of having put down the bad.

Descartes bestowed one eye on the blind, which enabled them to discover the blunders of antiquity as well as his own: the road he laid open is, since his time, become infinitely frequented. Rohault's little book was formerly deemed a complete system of physics: at this day, all the collections of the several academies of Europe do not form what may be called a good introduction to this science. By dint of sounding this abyss, we have at last discovered it to be bottomless, and really infinite.

On NEWTON.

NEWTON was firſt intended for the church. He ſet out with the ſtudy of divinity, and retained a tincture of it to his dying day. He very ſeriouſly adopted the cauſe of Arius againſt Athanaſius, and even went farther than he, as all the Socinians actually do. There are at preſent a great many of the learned of this opinion; I ſhall not venture to ſay of this communion, as they make no diſtinct body. They are, moreover, divided amongſt themſelves; and ſeveral of them have brought their ſyſtem to pure Deiſm, to which they have adapted the morality of Jeſus Chriſt. Newton was by no means of the number of theſe latter, and differed from the Engliſh church only on the point of Conſubſtantiation, being orthodox in all the reſt.

A proof of the ſincerity of his faith, is his writing a commentary on the Revelations. Here he finds it clear, to a demonſtration, that the pope is Antichriſt, and explains the reſt of this book exactly as the other commentators have done. Poſſibly he meant, by this commentary, to conſole the reſt of the human race for the great ſuperiority he had over them. There are ſeveral who, having read the little treatiſe of Metaphyſics which Newton has placed at the end of his *Principia Mathematica*, have met with ſomewhat full as obſcure as the Apocalypſe. Metaphyſicians and theologians are much like thoſe kind of gladiators who were obliged to fight hood-winked. But when Newton worked with the bandage removed from his eyes on his mathematics, his ſight pierced to the utmoſt limits of nature.

He invented the calculation of infinites; he has diſcovered and demonſtrated a new principle, which ſets the univerſe in motion. Light was wholly unknown before his time. There were only confuſed and falſe ideas of it, till Newton pronounced the moſt admirable *fiat*, and ſaid, *Let light be known, and light was known.*

He was the inventor of reflecting teleſcopes; and the firſt that ever was ſeen was the work of his own hands. He likewiſe demonſtrated the reaſon why the power and focus of common teleſcopes are not to be augmented. It was owing to this new teleſcope that a German took Newton for a mechanic, that is, for a ſpectacle-maker. *Artifex quidam nomine Newton*, ſays he, in ſome paultry book. But poſterity has ſince ſufficiently revenged the affront. He had ſtill greater injuſtice done him in France, where he was held as a blundering trier of experiments; and becauſe Mariotte made uſe of falſe priſms, the diſcoveries of Newton were exploded.

He was admired by his countrymen as ſoon as he had publiſhed and proved the truth of his theory by his new-invented inſtruments; but it was forty years before he was properly known in France. But to make amends, we had the fluted and ramoſe matter of Deſcartes, the little ſoft vortices of the reverend father Mallebranche, and the ſyſtem of M. Privat de Moliere, which is yet much inferior in value to the works of Poquelin de Moliere.

There is no one of thoſe who were in the leaſt acquainted with cardinal Polignac, who has not heard him ſay a number of times, that Newton was certainly a Peripatetic, and that his coloured rays and his attraction bordered very near on atheiſm. Cardinal de Polignac joined to all thoſe advantages he had received from nature, a very great ſhare of eloquence: he compoſed verſes in Latin with a ſurpriſing and a happy facility; but he knew no other philoſophy than that of Deſcartes, all of whoſe argnments he had retained, juſt like ſo many dates. He was not yet become a geometrician, and nature had not formed him for a philoſopher. He was an excellent judge of Catiline's Conſpiracy, or of an Æneis; but, by no means, fit to decide on the merits of a Locke or a Newton.

When one conſiders that Newton, Locke, Clarke, and Leibnitz, would have been perſecuted in France, impriſoned at Rome, and burned at Liſbon, what are we to think of human reaſon? One would ſwear it was a native

a native of England in the preſent age at leaſt. In the time of queen Mary there was a violent perſecution, on account of the proper way of pronouncing Greek, in which the perſecutors were, as uſual, in the wrong. They who put Galileo into the inquiſition were ſtill more ſo; and every inquiſitor ought to bluſh, from the bottom of his ſoul, at the ſight of the ſphere of Copernicus. Notwithſtanding, had Newton been born in Portugal, and a Dominican friar happened to have diſcovered a hereſy in his inverted ratio of the ſquares of the diſtances of the planets, Sir Iſaac Newton had certainly walked in proceſſion in his *ſanbenito** at ſome *Auto dé Fa.*

It has been often aſked, how it comes to paſs that they who, by their function, ought to be learned and humane, have ſo commonly proved, to the laſt degree, ignorant and implacable? Their ignorance was wholly owing to their having ſtudied too cloſely, and too much; and their unrelenting cruelty was occaſioned by the conſciouſneſs, that their wretched learning was the juſt object of the contempt of true philoſophers. Notwithſtanding, thoſe very inquiſitors, who had the effrontery to condemn the ſyſtem of Copernicus, not only as heretical but as abſurd, had not the ſmalleſt grounds of apprehenſion from that ſyſtem. Although the earth performed her annual revolution round the ſun, together with the reſt of the planets; the church would, for all that, have enjoyed both her revenues and her dignities. Even the eccleſiaſtical dogmas are in perfect ſafety, when impugned only by philoſophers: all the academies under the cope of heaven are not able, with their utmoſt efforts, to make the ſmalleſt revolution in the common creed of a nation, let its tenets be ever ſo abſurd. From what ſource, then, ariſes this pious rage, which has ſo often inflamed the Anitus's againſt the Socrates's? It is becauſe the Anitus's are conſcious, that

* This is a corruption of *ſacco benito*, the ſackcloth worn by penitents in the primitive church. It is now the name given to the ſcapulary, or broad piece of cloth marked with the ſign of the Croſs, put upon convicted heretics when they are brought from the Inquiſition to the ſtake.

they merit and enjoy the ſovereign contempt of the Socrates's.

I had a notion in my younger days, that Newton had made his fortune by his extraordinary merit. I made no doubt that both court and city at London had created him, with one common conſent, chief manager and ſupreme director of the coin of the kingdom. I was herein greatly miſtaken; Sir Iſaac Newton had a pretty niece, called Mrs. Conduite, who had the good fortune to pleaſe the lord high treaſurer * Haliſax. Had it not been for this handſome niece, his doctrine of gravitation and *infiniteſimalis*, had been wholly uſeleſs to him, and he might have ſtarved with all his talents.

* The earl of Halifax was chancellor of the Exchequer.

ON CHRONOLOGY,

AS REFORMED BY NEWTON.

Who makes the World younger than the common æra by five hundred years.

I Come now to take notice of another work, more within the reach of the human mind; but which, notwithſtanding, diſcovers that creative genius that Mr. Newton diſplayed in all his productions. This is his ſyſtem of Chronology, which is wholly new; for he appears to have been fated, in whatever ſubject he engaged, to make a total revolution, in the common received opinions of the reſt of mankind. Accuſtomed as he was to bring order out of confuſion, and to fetch beauty and regularity from the chaos of opinions he examined, he engaged in this work with a view to throw light upon thoſe remote parts of hiſtory, where fables and facts lay jumbled together, and to fix and aſcertain very doubtful chronology. One thing is paſt all manner of doubt, that there is ſcarce a family, city, or nation, which does not endeavour, by all poſſible means, to carry their original as far back into antiquity as may be. Beſides, the firſt hiſtorians are generally the leaſt exact in fixing the dates of tranſactions. Books were then a thouſand times ſcarcer than at preſent, and conſequently were leſs obnoxious to criticiſm; they impoſed on mankind with greater impunity: and as it in unqueſtionable that facts have frequently been forged, it is more than probable that dates have been ſo likewiſe. Upon the whole, it appeared to Mr. Newton, that the world was younger by five hundred years than the accounts of the chronologers make it. He grounds his conjecture on the common courſe of nature, and on aſtronomical obſervations.

What is here meant by the common courſe of nature, is the duration of each generation of men. The

Egyptians were the firſt that made uſe of this vague way of computation, in their accounts of the firſt periods in their hiſtory. They reckoned three hundred and forty-one generations from Menes to Sethon; and having no fixed dates, they reckoned three generations made up the ſpace of one hundred years. Thus, from the reign of Menes to that Sethon; they computed eleven thouſand three hundred and forty years. The Greeks, before the inſtitution of the Olympiads, followed the ſame method of computation with the Egyptians, and ſomewhat augmented the duration of each generation, by valuing each at about forty years. Now both Greeks and Egyptians were moſt egregiouſly out by this method of calculation. It is true according to the common courſe of nature, three generations make pretty nearly from one hundred to ſix-ſcore years; but it is far from following from hence that three reigns make up this number of years. Thus a man, who ſhould ſet about writing a hiſtory, without the aſſiſtance of fixed epochas, and having learned that in ſuch a nation there had been a ſeries of nine kings, would err conſiderably in allowing three hundred years for thoſe nine kings. Each generation is about thirty years, and each reign about twenty, one with another. If we take the thirty kings who have reigned in England from William the Conqueror to George I. their reigns will be found to amount to ſix hundred and forty-eight years, which, divided by thirty, the number of thoſe kings, will allow about one and twenty years and a half for each reign. This is properly the common courſe of nature. The ancients were therefore deceived in making the duration of reigns and that of generations to be generally equal; they have conſequently over-reckoned themſelves, ſo that there is a neceſſity to retrench this computation a little.

Aſtronomical obſervations ſeem to yield our philoſopher ſtill greater aid. He fights to advantage on his ground. The earth, you know, beſides its annual motion which whirls it round the ſun from Weſt to Eaſt in the ſpace of a year, has likewiſe a peculiar revolution altogether unknown till theſe latter ages. Its poles have

have a very ſlow retrograde motion from Eaſt to Weſt, ſo that its poſition is every day changed with regard to the heavens. This yearly change of poſition, though inſenſible, becomes conſiderable in time, ſo as in ſeventy-two years to amount to one degree; that is to ſay, the three hundredth and ſixtieth part of the heavens. Hence, in the ſpace of ſeventy two years the vernal equinoctial colure, which, in the beginning of that period, paſſed through a certain fixed ſtar, will at the end of it paſs through a different fixed ſtar. From this it follows that the ſun, inſtead of being in that part of the heavens where the ram was placed in the time of Hipparchus, is found to correſpond to that part of the heavens where the conſtellation of the Bull is ſituated, and the Twins have ſucceeded to the place in which the Bull then was. All the ſigns have changed places; notwithſtanding we have retained the way of ſpeaking aſſumed by the ancients. We ſay, for inſtance, that the ſun in the ſpring is in the Ram, by the ſame complaitance by which we ſay the ſun moves.

Hipparchus was the firſt of the Greeks who perceived that ſome change happened in the conſtellations with regard to the equinoxes, or rather learned this circumſtance of the Egyptians. Their philoſophers attributed this motion to the ſtars, for at that time of day they were very far from imagining any ſuch revolution in the earth. It was believed by them wholly immoveable: they therefore created a heaven, in which they ſtuck all the fixed ſtars, and this heaven they gave a particular motion, which cauſed it to advance towards the Eaſt, whilſt all the ſtars ſeemed to have a daily revolution from Eaſt to Weſt. To this error they added a ſecond, which was much more conſequential. They believed that this imaginary heaven of the fixed ſtars advanced one degree towards the Eaſt in a hundred years. Thus they were miſtaken in their aſtronomical calculations, as well as in their ſyſtem of the univerſe: for inſtance, an aſtronomer would then have ſaid that the vernal equinox was in the time of ſuch an obſerver, in ſuch a ſign, and in ſuch a fixed ſtar. He has made a progreſs of two degrees from that obſervator to our time:

time: now, two degrees are equal to two hundred years; therefore it follows, that this obſervator muſt have lived two hundred years before us. It is certain that an aſtronomer who ſhould have reaſoned in this manner, would have been wrong by about fifty years. This is then the reaſon why the ancient aſtronomers, thus doubly deceived, made their great year of the world (that is to ſay, of the revolution of the whole heavens) to conſiſt of about thirty-ſix thouſand years. But the moderns know, that this imaginary revolution of the ſtarry heavens, is no more than the revolution of the poles of the earth, which it performs in twenty-five thouſand nine hundred years. It will be proper to obſerve by-the-by, that Mr. Newton, in determining the figure of the earth, has very happily explained this revolution.

All this being laid down, it remains, in order to aſcertain chronology to ſee at what fixed ſtar the equinoxial colure now cuts the ecliptic in the ſpring, and to know whether ſome of ancients may not have informed us in what point the ecliptic was cut in his time by the ſame equinoxial colure. Clemens Alexandrinus relates, that Chiron, who was in the expedition of the Argonauts, obſerved the conſtellations in the time of that famous expedition, and fixed the vernal equinox in the middle of the Bear, the autumnal equinox in the middle of the Balance, our ſummer ſolſtice in the middle of Cancer, and the winter ſolſtice in the middle of Capricorn.

A long time after the expedition of the Argonauts, and a year before the Peloponneſian war, Meton obſerved that the point of the ſummer ſolſtice paſſed thro' the ſixth degree of Cancer.

Now each ſign in the Zodiac conſiſts of thirty degrees. In the time of Chiron the ſolſtice was in the middle of the ſign, that is to ſay, in its fifteenth degree; a year before the Peloponneſian war, it was in the eighth degree; it had therefore been retrograde ſeven degrees; a degree then being equal to ſeventy-two years, it follows that from the beginning of the Peloponneſian war to the expedition of the Argonauts, there are but ſeven times

times ſeventy-two, which makes five hundred and four years, and not ſeven hundred years as the Greeks ſay.

Thus, by comparing the ſtate of the heavens at this day to the ſtate in which it then was, we ſee the expedition of the Argonauts ought to have been placed nine hundred and nine years before Jeſus Chriſt, and not about fourteen hundred years, and that conſequently the world is younger by about five hundred years than was commonly imagined.

By this means all the epochas are brought nearer to us, and every tranſaction is made to happen later than they are ſaid to have been. This ſyſtem ſeems to me to be true, tho' I dare not take upon me to ſay whether it will be adopted by the multitude, or whether men will hence be brought to reform the vulgar chronology. The learned may poſſibly be of opinion, that it woul be doing too much honour to one and the ſame perſon to allow him to have perfected phyſics, geometry, and hiſtory; this would be a kind of univerſal monarchy in literature, which ſelf-love will not eaſily put up with. Thus, whilſt the partizans of vortices and fluted matter attacked gravitation, which had been already demonſtrated, the reverend father Souciet and Mr. Freret were writing againſt Newton's chronology before it was printed.

N. B. The chapters on light and attraction have been retrenched here, but will be found in that part of this edition which treats on Philoſophy, which is their proper place.

ON THE

ENGLISH TRAGEDY.

THE Engliſh had a regular theatre, as well as the Spaniards, whilſt the French had as yet but booths. Shakeſpear, whom the Engliſh conſider as another Sophocles, flouriſhed about the time of Lopez de Vega: he was properly the creator of their theatre. His genius was at once ſtrong and abundant, natural and ſublime, but without the ſmalleſt ſpark of taſte, and void of the remoteſt idea of the rules. I will venture to tell you a bold, but yet undoubted truth; which is, that the merit of this author has been the ruin of the Engliſh ſtage: there are in him ſcenes ſo perfectly beautiful, and paſſages ſo very full of the great and terrible, ſpread up and down thoſe monſtrous farces of his which they have chriſtened tragedies, that his pieces have always been played with prodigious ſucceſs. Time, which alone is capable of eſtabliſhing the reputation of authors, ſerves at length to conſecrate their very defects. The greateſt part of thoſe extravagant paſſages, and of that bombaſt which abounds in his works, have, in the courſe of an hundred and fifty years, acquired a kind of title to paſs for the true ſublime. Their modern authors are, generally ſpeaking, no more than copiers of him, though what ſucceeded in *Shakeſpear* is hiſſed in them; and you know the veneration they entertain for this author increaſes in proportion to their contempt of the moderns. They never once reflect that it is abſurd to pretend to imitate him; and it is wholly owing to the ill ſucceſs of thoſe copiers, and not to their want of capacity, that he is thought inimitable.

You know that in the tragedy of the Moor of Venice, a very intereſting piece, a huſband ſmothers his wife on the ſtage, and the poor woman dies aſſerting her innocence. You are not ignorant that in Hamlet a couple

a couple of grave-diggers dig a grave upon the ſtage, ſinging and drinking at their work, and paſſing the low jokes common to theſe ſort of people, on the ſkulls they throw up: but what will moſt aſtoniſh you, is, that theſe fooleries have been imitated.

In the reign of Charles the Second, which was the reign of politeneſs, and the æra of the fine arts, Otway, in his *Venice Preſerved*, introduced the ſenator *Antonio*, and his courtezan *Aquilina*, in the midſt of the horrors of *Bedemar*'s conſpiracy; the old ſenator plays all the monkey-tricks, on the ſtage, of an old impotent crazy letcher. He minicks by turns a bull, and a dog, and he bites his miſtreſs's legs, who alternately whips and kicks him. Theſe buffooneries, however, calculated to pleaſe the rabble, have ſince been omitted in the repreſentation of this piece; but in *Julius Cæſar*, the idle jeſts of Roman ſhoemakers and coblers are ſtill introduced on the ſtage with Caſſius and Brutus.

You will, no doubt, lament that thoſe who have hitherto ſpoken to you of the Engliſh ſtage, and particularly of the celebrated Shakeſpear, have only pointed out his errors, and that no one has tranſlated thoſe ſtriking paſſages in this great man which atone for all his faults. To this I ſhall anſwer, that it is very eaſy to recount in proſe the abſurdities of a poet, but very difficult to tranſlate his fine verſes; thoſe who ſet themſelves up for critics of celebrated writers generally compile volumes; but I had rather read two pages which diſcover only their beauties; for I ſhall always concur with all men of taſte in this opinion, that there is more to be learnt in a dozen verſes of Homer or Virgil, than in all the criticiſms on thoſe great men.

I have ventured to tranſlate ſome paſſages of the beſt Engliſh poets, and I begin with one of Shakeſpear's.—Be indulgent to the copy, in honor to the original; and always remember, that when you ſee a tranſlation, you perceive only a faint copy of a fine picture. I have ſelected the ſoliloquy in the tragedy of Hamlet, which is univerſally known, and begins with this line:

To be, or not to be! that is the queſtion!

It is Hamlet prince of Denmark who ſpeaks.

Demeure, il faut choiſir, & paſſer à l' inſtant
De la vie à la mort, ou de l' être au néant.
Dieux juſtes, s'il en eſt, éclairez mon courage.
Faut-il vieillir courbé ſous la main qui m'outrage,
Supporter, ou finir mon malheur & mon ſort?
Qui ſuis-je? Que m'arrête? Et qu'eſt-ce que la mort?
C'eſt la fin de nos maux, c'eſt mon unique azile;
Après de longs tranſports, c'eſt un ſommeil tranquile.
On s' endort, & tout meurt; mais un affreux réveil
Doit ſuccéder peut-être aux douceurs du ſommeil.
On nous menace, on dit, que cette courte vie
De tourmens éternels eſt auſſi tôt ſuivie.
O mort! moment fatal! affreuſe éternité!
Tout cœur à ton ſeul nom ſe glace épouvanté.
Eh! qui pourrait ſans toi ſupporter cette vie?
De nos Prêtres menteurs bénir l' hypocriſie?
D' une indigne maîtreſſe encenſer les erreurs?
Ramper ſous un Miniſtre, adorer ſes hauteurs?
Et montrer les langueurs de ſon ame abattue,
A des amis ingrats, qui détournent la vue?
La mort ſerait trop douce en ces extrêmités.
Mais le ſcrupule parle, & nous crie, Arrêtez.
Il défend à nos mains cet heureux homicide,
Et d' un Héros guerrier, fait un Chrêtien timide.

Do not imagine that I have given you the Engliſh word for word; — woe be to thoſe literal tranſlators, who, by rendering every ſingle word, enervate the ſenſe! It is in this caſe that we may truly ſay, "The letter kills, and the ſpirit revives."*

I ſhall now give you a paſſage from the famous Dryden, an Engliſh poet who flouriſhed in the reign of Charles the Second; an author more fertile than judicious,

* Were this paraphraſe tranſlated literally, an Engliſh reader would ſcarcely recognize in it any traces of the original. It muſt be owned, however, that M. de Voltaire has avoided the confuſion of metaphors which is to be found in Shakeſpear.

ous, who would have preſerved an unblemiſhed reputation, if he had wrote only the tenth part of his works.

The paſſage begins thus:

When I conſider life, 'tis all a cheat;
Yet, fool'd by hope, men favour the deceit, &c.

De deſſeins en regrets, & d' erreurs en déſirs,
Les mortels inſenſés proménent leur folie,
Dans des malheurs préſens, dans l' eſpoir des plaiſirs.
Nous ne vivons jamais, nous attendons la vie.
Demain, demain, dit-on, va combler tous nos vœux.
Demain vient, & nous laiſſe encor plus malheureux.
Quelle eſt l' erreur, helas! du ſoin qui nous dévore?
Nul de nous ne voudrait recommencer ſon cours.
De nos premiers momens nous maudiſſons l' aurore,
Et de la nuit qui vient, nous attendons encore
Ce qu'ont en vain promis les plus beaux de nos jours,
&c.

It is in theſe detached ſentences that the Engliſh tragedies have hitherto excelled: Their pieces, almoſt always barbarous, void of decency, order, and probability, have yet, amidſt this night of Darkneſs, their ſplendid days of light: their ſtile is too ſtiff, too unnatural, too much copied from the Hebrew writers, and too full of Aſiatic bombaſt; but then the mind is tranſported to an amazing height, ſoaring on the pinions of the metaphorical ſtile which adorns the Engliſh language.

It ſometimes ſeems as if nature were not the ſame in England as elſewhere. This ſame Dryden, in his farce of Don Sebaſtian king of Portugal, which he calls a tragedy, makes an officer give the following reply to that monarch:

LE ROI SEBASTIEN.

Ne me connais-tu pas, traitre, inſolent!

DORAX.

Qui moi?
Je te connais fort bien, mais non pas pour mon Roi.

Tu

Tu n'es plus dans Liſbonne, où ta Cour mépriſable
Nourriſſait de ton cœur l'orgueil inſupportable.
Un tas d'illuſtres ſots & de fripons titrés,
Et de gueux du bel air & d'eſclaves dorés,
Chatouillait ton oreille & faſcinait ta vue;
On t'entourait en cercle ainſi qu'une ſtatue.
Quand tu diſais un mot, chacun le cou tendu,
S'empreſſait d'applaudir ſans t'avoir entendu;
Et ce troupeau ſervile admirait en ſilence
Ta royale ſottiſe & ta noble arrogance:
Mais te voilà réduit à ta juſte valeur. . . .

SEBASTIAN.

——Be warn'd, and know me for thy king.

DORAX.

Too well I know thee, but for king no more:
This is not Liſbon, nor the circle this,
Where, like a ſtatue, thou haſt ſtood beſieg'd
By ſycophants and fools, the growth of courts.
Where thy gull'd eyes, in all the gaudy round,
Met nothing but a lie in every face;
And the groſs flattery of a gaping crowd,
Envious who firſt ſhould catch, and firſt applaud
The ſtuff, or royal nonſenſe.

This ſpeech is in the Engliſh taſte; and the whole piece is full of buffoonry: How ſhall we reconcile, ſay our critics, ſo much good ſenſe with ſuch abſurdity, ſo much meanneſs with ſuch ſublimity of expreſſion? Nothing ſo eaſy; let it be remembered, that they were wrote by men. The Spaniſh ſtage has all the faults of the Engliſh, without its beauties; and, in reality, what were the Greek authors? what Euripides, who, in the ſame piece, paints ſo affecting, ſo noble a picture of Alceſtes ſacrificing herſelf to the manes of her huſband, and puts into the mouth of Admetes and his father ſuch groſs puerilities, that have puzzled even his commentators? A reader muſt have great patience and fortitude not to find Homer's ſleepy fit ſometimes a little tedious, and

and his dreams inſipid?—It will require many ages to purify good taſte—Virgil among the Romans, Racine among the French, were the firſt who always preſerved a purity of taſte in capital pieces.

Addiſon was the firſt Engliſhman who wrote a rational tragedy; but I ſhould pity him if he had only made it barely rational. His tragedy of Cato is wrote from the beginning to the end with that maſterly and energic elegance of which Corneille firſt gave ſuch fine examples in his unequal ſtile. It appears to me that this piece is adapted to an audience ſomewhat philoſophic, and very republican. I much doubt if our young ladies and petits-maîtres would have reliſhed Cato in his night-gown, reading Plato's dialogues, and making reflections on the immortality of the ſoul: but thoſe who ſoar above the cuſtoms, the prejudices, and the foibles of their own nation, who are of every age, and of every country, thoſe who prefer philoſophic grandeur to ſoft tales of love, will be pleaſed to find here a copy, though an imperfect one, of that ſublime ſcene.—It ſeems as if Addiſon, in this fine ſoliloquy, aimed at rivalling Shakeſpear. I will tranſlate the one as I did the other; I mean, with that freedom without which we are too apt to wander from the original, by endeavouring at too cloſe an imitation. The ground-work is faithfully pourtrayed, I ſhall only add a few ſhades. Not being able to equal him, I muſt attempt to improve upon him.

Oui, Platon, tu dis vrai, notre ame eſt immortelle.
C'eſt un Dieu qui lui parle, un Dieu qui vit en elle.
Eh! d'ou viendrait ſans lui ſe grand preſſentiment,
Ce dégout des faux biens, cette horreur du néant?
Vers des ſiécles ſans fin je ſens que tu m'entraines.
Du monde & de mes ſens je vai briſer les chaines,
Et m'ouvrir loin d'un corps dan la fange arrêté
Les portes de la vie & de l'éternité.
L'éternité! quel mot conſolant & terrible!
O lumiére! O nuage! O profondeur horrible!
Que ſuis-je? où ſuis-je? où vai-je! & d'où ſuis-je tire?

Dans

Dans quels climats nouveaux, dans quel monde ignoré,
Le moment du trépas va-t-il plonger mon être ?
Où ſera cet eſprit qui ne peut ſe connaître ?
Que me préparez-vous, abîmes ténébreux ?
Allons, s' il eſt un Dieu, Caton doit être heureux.
Il eſt un ſans doute, & je ſuis ſon ouvrage.
Lui-même au cœur du juſte il empreint ſon image.
Il doit venger ſa cauſe & punir les pervers.
Mais comment ! dans quel tems ? & dans quel Univers ?
Ici la vertu pleure, & l'audace l'opprime ;
L'innocence à genoux y tend la gorge au crime ;
La fortune y domine, & tout y ſuit ſon char.
Ce globe infortuné fut formé pour Céſar.
Hâtons nous de ſortir d' une priſon funeſte.
Je te verrai ſans ombre, ô vérité céleſte ?
Tu te caches de nous dans nos jours de ſommeil :
Cette vie eſt un ſonge, & la mort un réveil.

In this tragedy of a patriot and philoſopher, the character of Cato appears to me to be one of the moſt complete that ever appeared on any ſtage: The Cato of Addiſon is, in my opinion, greatly ſuperior to the Cornelia of Pierre Corneille, for he is continually great without oſtentation; and the part of Cornelia, beſides being an unneceſſary one, is in many places too declamatory: ſhe would always be the heroine, and Cato never perceives that he is the hero.

It is a great pity that ſo fine a piece ſhould not be a complete tragedy: unconnected ſcenes, which often leave the ſtage empty, injudicious and tedious apart or *aſide* ſpeeches, cold and inſipid amours, a conſpiracy quite foreign to the piece, a certain Sempronius diſguſted and killed on the ſtage; all theſe put together render the celebrated tragedy * of Cato a performance that our comedians would never venture to preſent, even if we were of the ſame way of thinking as the Romans, or the

* After all, the tragedy of Cato is a cold, declamatory piece, which owed its great ſucceſs upon the ſtage to the circumſtances of the time at which it was exhibited.

the Engliſh themſelves. The barbariſm and irregularity of the theatre at London made an impreſſion on Addiſon's better judgment: methinks, I ſee in him the Czar Peter, who, in reforming the Ruſſians, ſtill retained ſome prejudices of his education, and of the manners of his country.

The cuſtom of introducing love, right or wrong, into dramatic works, paſſed over from Paris to London about the year 1660, with our ribbons and perukes. The ladies, who there as well as here embelliſh the theatre, would no longer ſuffer any other but love-ſcenes on the ſtage. The ſage Addiſon had the effeminate complaiſance to bend the ſeverity of his character to the manners of his time, and ſpoiled a maſter-piece to comply with the reigning mode.

Since his time the pieces are become more regular, the people more difficult, and the authors more timid. I have ſeen very decent, but very flat, modern compoſitions: it ſeems as if the Engliſh poets had hitherto been born to produce only irregular beauties.

The poetic genius of the Engliſh reſembles, at this day, a ſpreading tree planted by nature, ſhooting forth at random a thouſand branches, and growing with unequal ſtrength: it dies if you force its nature, or ſhape it into a regular tree, fit for the gardens of Marly.

ON

ON THE

ENGLISH COMEDY.

IF in moſt of the Engliſh tragedies the heroes are aukward and the heroines extravagant, in return the ſtile is more natural in comedy; but then this ſtile would appear to us rather the ſtile of debauchery than of politeneſs: it diſtinguiſhes every thing by its proper name; a woman, enraged at her lover, wiſhes him the pox; a drunkard, in a piece that is very often performed, is diſguiſed like a prieſt, makes a great riot, and is arreſted by the watch: he calls himſelf a Curate; he is aſked what cure he has; and he replies, An excellent one for the ..... In one of the moſt decent comedies, The Careleſs Huſband, this huſband is repreſented having his head rubbed by a ſervant-maid, who is ſeated by his ſide: his wife enters, and exclaims — To what power may one not arrive by being a whore! Some Cynics juſtify theſe groſs expreſſions, and quote the example of Horace, who deſcribes, by their proper names, all the parts of the human body, and all the pleaſures they give. Theſe are images that ſucceed with us only when properly veiled; but Horace, who ſeemed made for the ſtews as well as for the court, and who perfectly underſtood the cuſtoms of both, ſpeaks as freely of the way of a man with a maid, as if he was deſcribing a walk, or a collation. It has been obſerved, that the Romans, in the days of Auguſtus, were as polite as the Pariſians are at preſent; and that this very Horace, who praiſes the emperor Auguſtus for reforming the manners, complied, without ſcruple, with the cuſtoms of the times, which permitted the promiſcuous uſe of girls and boys, and of the proper names of things. Strange it is (if any thing can be ſaid to be ſo) that Horace, while ſpeaking the language of a debauchee, ſhould be the favourite of a reformer; and that Ovid, for ſpeaking only the language of gallantry, ſhould be exiled

exiled by a debauchee, an impoſtor, an aſſaſſin, called Octavius, who acquired the empire by crimes which merited death.

However this be, Bayle pretends that expreſſions are indifferent, in which he, the Cynics, and the Stoics, deceive themſelves; for every thing has different names which repreſent it under different aſpects, and afford different ideas of it. The words "magiſtrate and lawyer, gentleman and 'ſquire, officer and ſharper, monk and friar," have not the ſame ſignification. The conſummation of marriage, and every thing that contributes to the completion of this great work, will be differently expreſſed by the parſon, the huſband, the phyſician, and the rake. The word the latter of theſe would make uſe of would awaken the idea of pleaſure, the terms the phyſician would explain himſelf in would put you in mind of a dead body, the huſband would make that underſtood with decency which the young libertine had deſcribed immodeſtly, and the parſon would attempt to give you the idea of a ſacrament. Words then are not in themſelves indifferent; for they are not ſynonimous.

It muſt further be conſidered, that tho' the Romans permitted theſe groſs expreſſions in ſatires, which were read but by a few people, they never ſuffered indecent words on the ſtage; for, as La Fontaine ſays, "Chaſte are the ears, although the eyes are wanton." In a word, no expreſſion ſhould be made uſe of in public, which a modeſt woman would be aſhamed to repeat.

The Engliſh have ſtolen, diſguiſed, and mangled, moſt of Moliere's plays. They attempted to make a *Tartuffe*. It was impoſſible that this ſubject ſhould ſucceed at London, becauſe the portrait of a ſtranger affords very little pleaſure. One of the bleſſings of the Engliſh nation is, that ſhe has no *Tartuffes**: to have hypocrites, it is neceſſary to have bigots; but the name of bigot is almoſt unknown there, while that of an honeſt man is common. He ſees no dotards committing to others

* Our author is very much miſtaken if he thinks there are no religious hypocrites in England.

others the care of their ſouls; no petty tyrants eſtabliſhing a deſpotic empire, in ſome quarter of the city, over a ſet of ſuperannuated females, who were once coquets, and always weak; and over men ſtill more weak and deſpicable. Philoſophy, liberty, and the climate, lead the way to miſanthropy. London, which has no *Tartuffes*, abounds with Timons. The *Plain Dealer* is one of the beſt Engliſh comedies: it was wrote at the time when Charles II. and his ſplendid court, were endeavouring to laugh away the ſettled gloom that had overſpread the nation. Wycherly, the author of this comedy, was the profeſſed admirer of the ducheſs of Cleveland, the king's miſtreſs. This man, who paſſed his life in the gay world, as it is called, painted its follies and abſurdities in the ſtrongeſt colours. The ſtrokes are bolder in Wycherly's piece than in Moliere's; but they are not ſo delicate, nor ſo refined. The Engliſh author has corrected the only fault in Moliere's piece, the want of plot and intrigue; the Engliſh comedy is intereſting, the intrigue is ingenious, but too bold for our manners.

A captain of a ſhip, of diſtinguiſhed courage and frankneſs, and a profeſſed deſpiſer of mankind, has a ſincere and prudent friend whom he miſtruſts, and a miſtreſs, by whom he is tenderly beloved, whom he ſlights: whilſt he places all his confidence in a falſe friend, the moſt unworthy of men; and gives his heart to a jilt, the moſt perfidious of her ſex. He believes, however, that this woman is a Penelope, and this falſe friend a Cato: he ſets out on an expedition againſt the Dutch, and leaves all his money, jewels, and other effects, in the hands of this woman, to the care of this friend he ſo firmly relies on; while the true friend, whom he miſtruſts, embarks with him, and the lady, to whom he has not deigned to pay the leaſt regard, diſguiſes herſelf in the habit of a page, and performs the voyage with him, without diſcovering her ſex the whole time.

The captain's ſhip being blown up in an engagement, he returns to London in the utmoſt diſtreſs, accompanied by his friend and the page, without knowing the friendſhip

friendſhip of the one, or the love of the other. He goes immediately to that paragon of women from whom he expects to receive his ſtrong box, and a freſh proof of her fidelity. He finds her married to the ſharper he had confided in, and can get no account of the treaſure he had committed to her charge. The good man will hardly believe that ſo virtuous a woman could be guilty of ſuch baſeneſs; when the better to convince him of it, this honeſt lady falls in love with the little page, and attempts to take him away by force: but as it is neceſſary, in a dramatic piece, that juſtice ſhould take place, vice be puniſhed, and virtue meet its reward, at the cloſe of the cataſtrophe, the captain ſupplies the place of the page, goes to bed to his inconſtant miſtreſs, cuckolds his treacherous friend, runs him through the body, recovers the remains of his effects, and marries his page. You will obſerve, that this piece is interlarded with an old litigious woman, related to the captain, who is one of the merrieſt creatures, and one of the beſt characters, on the ſtage.

Wycherly has taken another piece from Moliere not leſs bold and ſingular; 'tis a ſort of a "School for Women." The principal character in the piece is a drole libertine, the terror of the huſbands of London; who, to make ſure of his buſineſs, ſpreads a report, that, in a late illneſs, his ſurgeons had found it neceſſary to make him an eunuch. Having this curious character, the huſbands grant him free acceſs to their wives, and his only difficulty is where to fix his choice. However, at laſt, he gives the preference to a little country-woman, who has a great ſhare of innocence, with a natural warmth of conſtitution, by which ſhe makes her huſband a cuckold with a good-will and readineſs that far exceeds the premeditated malice of experienced dames. This piece is not indeed "The School of Morality;" but it is "The School of Wit and true comic Humour."

The comedies of Sir John Vanbrugh are more facetious, but leſs ingenious. The knight was a man of pleaſure, and beſides a poet and an architect. It is remarked, that he wrote as delicately and as elegantly as

he built clumſily: it was he who built the famous caſtle of Blenheim, the heavy but durable monument of our unfortunate battle of Hochſtet. If the apartments were only as large as the walls are thick, this manſion would be convenient enough. In Sir John Vanbrugh's epitaph, the earth is invoked to lie heavy on him, who, when living, had laid ſuch heavy loads upon it. This gentleman took a tour into France juſt before the curious war of 1701, and was put into the Baſtile, where he remained ſome time, without knowing what it was that had procured him this mark of diſtinction from our miniſtry. He wrote a comedy in the Baſtile, and, what is in my opinion very remarkable, there is not in all the piece the leaſt ſtroke againſt the country where he ſuffered this violence.

Of all the Engliſh writers, the late Mr. Congreve has carried the glory of the comic theatre to the higheſt pitch. He wrote but a few pieces, but they are all excellent of their kind: the laws of the drama are ſtrictly obſerved in them; they are full of characters elegantly varied; no mean pleaſantry, not the leaſt indecency, is introduced: you find in every part the language of politeneſs, even in deſcribing the actions of knaves; which proves that he knew the world, and kept what is called good company. His comedies are the moſt ſpritely and correct, Sir John Vanbrugh's the gayeſt, and Wycherly's the boldeſt. It is to be obſerved, that none of theſe ſublime wits have ſpoken ill of Moliere: it is only writers of no repute that have vilify'd this great man. In a word, do not expect from me any extracts from theſe Engliſh performances that I am ſo great an advocate for; nor that I ſhould give you a ſingle *bon mot* or jeſt from Congreve or Wycherly. One cannot laugh in a tranſlation. If you would be acquainted with the Engliſh comedy, you muſt go to London: you muſt reſide there three years; you muſt learn the language perfectly, and conſtantly frequent the theatre. I take no great pleaſure in reading Plautus or Ariſtophanes, becauſe I am neither Greek nor Roman. The delicate turn of *bon mots*, the alluſion, and the *a-propos*, is all loſt to a foreigner.

It

It is not the ſame in tragedy: that conſiſts alone in the ſublime paſſions, and heroic fooleries, conſecrated by the ſtale error of fables and hiſtories. OEdipus and Electra belong as much to us, to the Engliſh, and to the Spaniards, as to the Greeks: but true comedy is the living picture of the abſurdities of a country; and, if you are not thoroughly acquainted with the country, you can hardly judge of the painting.

It has been objected to the Engliſh, that their ſcene is bloody, and often covered with dead bodies; that their gladiators fight half naked before young girls, and often return from the combat with the loſs of a noſe or a cheek. In anſwer to this, they tell you, that they imitate the Greeks in tragedy, and the Romans in the act of cutting off noſes: but their theatre is widely different from that of Sophocles and Euripides; and, with reſpect to the Romans, it muſt be acknowledged, that a noſe or a cheek are trifles in compariſon of that multitude of victims that mutually butchered each other in the circus for the diverſion of the Roman ladies.

The Engliſh have ſometimes had dances in their comedies, which were allegorical, and of a very ſingular taſte. Deſpotic power and a republican ſtate were repreſented by a very gallant dance in the year 1709. A king appears in the dance, who, after a few capers, gives his prime miniſter a very ſevere kick on the ..... the miniſter beſtows it on a ſecond perſon, the ſecond on a third, and, in fine, he who received the laſt repreſented the bulk of the nation, which had no-body to revenge itſelf on: all was performed in cadence. The Republican government was repreſented by a round dance, where every one equally received and returned the blow. This, however, is the country that has given birth to Addiſons, Popes, Lockes, and Newtons.

On COURTIERS who have cultivated LEARNING.

THERE was a time when the arts were cultivated in France by perſons of the firſt diſtinction; even the courtiers applied themſelves to the Belles Lettres, in ſpite of that diſſipation, that taſte for trifles and that paſſion for intrigue, which are the deities of this country. It appears to me, that at preſent learning is not the reigning taſte at court. Perhaps the paſſion of ſtudying may one day return to us. The king has it in his power to do what he pleaſes with this nation. In England it is common to ſtudy, and learning is more in eſteem there than with us. This advantage is a neceſſary conſequence of their form of government. There are about eight hundred perſons at London that have a right to ſpeak in public, and to ſupport the intereſt of the nation: about five or ſix thouſand more pretend in their turns to the ſame happineſs; all the reſt erect themſelves into judges of theſe, and every one gives his thoughts in print on the public affairs. Thus the whole nation is under a kind of neceſſity of being inſtructed. Nothing is talked of but the Athenian and Roman governments. It is neceſſary, nevertheleſs, to read the authors who have treated of them. This ſtudy naturally leads to that of the *Belles-lettres*. In general men have the ſpirit or genius of their peculiar condition. Why have our magiſtrates, our phyſicians, and many of our eccleſiaſtics in general, more learning, taſte, and judgment, than are to be found among other profeſſions? It is becauſe their ſtation requires the cultivation of the mind, as that of a merchant demands a knowledge of commerce.

It is not long ſince a very young Engliſh nobleman paid me a viſit at Paris on his return from Italy: he had compoſed a poetical deſcription of that country, as politely

litely wrote as any of lord Rocheſter's verſes, or thoſe of our Chalieux, our Saraſins, or our Chapelles. The tranſlation I have made of them is ſo far from approaching the energy and lively humour of the original, that I am obliged ſincerely to aſk pardon of the author and thoſe who underſtand Engliſh: however, as I have no other way of making my lord Harvey's verſes known, take them in my language —

Qu'ai-je donc vû dans l' Italie ?
Orgueil. aſtuce ; & pauvreté ;
Grands complimens, peu de bonté,
Et beaucoup de ceremonie.

L' extravagante Comedie,
Que ſouvent l' Inquiſition.
Veut qu' one nomme Religion,
Mais qu'ici nous nommons folie.

La nature en vain beinfaiſante
Veut enrichir ces lieux charmans ;
Des Pretres la main deſolante
Etouffe ſes plus beaux préſens.

Les Monſignor, ſoi diſans grands,
Seuls dans leurs Palais magnifiques,
Y ſont d' illuſtres fainéans,
Sans argent & ſans domeſtiques.

Pour les petits, ſans liberté,
Martyrs du joug qui les domine ;
Ils ont fait vœu de pauvreté,
Priants Dieu par oiſiveté,
Et toujours jeûnans par famine.

Ces beaux lieux du Pape bénis
Semblent habités par les Diables ;
Et les habitans miserables
Sont damnés dans le Paradis.

I am not of Lord Harvey's opinion. There are countries in Italy which are very unfortunate, becauſe foreigners have, for a long time, been fighting for the government of them; but there are others where the people are neither ſo beggarly nor ſo fooliſh as he deſcribes them.

OF

OF THE
EARL of ROCHESTER,
AND
MR. WALLER.

THE earl of Rocheſter's reputation is univerſally known. Mr. de St. Evremond has taken great notice of him; but he has only made us acquainted with the celebrated Rocheſter as a man of pleaſure and intrigue. I propoſe to diſtinguiſh him as the man of genius and the poet. Among other works that are fraught with that lively imagination which he alone poſſeſſed, he wrote ſome ſatires on the ſame ſubjects as our celebrated Deſpreaux. I know nothing more uſeful towards perfecting true taſte, than the comparing the works of great men who have exerciſed their talents on the ſame ſubject. Obſerve in what manner Deſpreaux ſpeaks againſt human reaſon in his Satire on Man?

Cependant à le voir, plein de vapeurs légéres.
Soi-même ſe bercer de ſes propres chimères,
Lui ſeul de la Nature eſt la baſe & l'appui,
Et le dixiéme Ciel ne tourne que pour lui.
De tous les animaux il eſt ici le maître;
Qui pourrait le nier? pourſuis-tu: Moi peut-être.
Ce maître prétendu, qui leur donne des loix,
Ce Roi des animaux, combien a-t-il de Rois!

Behold him of his boaſted reaſon vain,
Drunk with the fumes of his diſtemper'd brain;
Of nature he the baſe, and corner-ſtone;
The Heav'n of Heav'ns revolves for him alone;
Of all that breathes on earth the ſov'reign lord,
And who will dare to doubt that ſov'reign's word?

Why, faith, my friend, that doubt belongs to me,
This king of beaſts, how many kings has he?

Obſerve likewiſe how very nearly Lord Rocheſter expreſſes himſelf on the ſame ſubject in his Satire on Man; but let the reader always remember, that mine are free tranſlations of the Engliſh poets, and that the curb of our verſification, and the delicate decorum of our language, will never form an equivalent for the impetuous flow of the Engliſh ſtile.

Cet eſprit que je hais, cet eſprit plein d'erreur,
Ce n'eſt pas ma raiſon, c'eſt la tienne, Docteur;
C'eſt la raiſon frivole, inquiéte, orgueilleuſe,
Des ſages animaux rivale dédaigneuſe,
Qui croit entr'eux & l'Ange occuper le milieu,
Et penſe être ici bas l'image de ſon Dieu.
Vil atome imparfait, qui croit, doute, diſpute,
Rampe, s'éleve, tombe, & nie encor ſa chute,
Qui nous dit, je ſuis libre, en nous montrant ſes fers,
Et dont l'œil trouble & faux croit percer l'Univers.
Allez, réverends fous, bienheureux fanatiques,
Compilez bien l'amas de vos riens ſcholaſtiques.
Peres de viſions, & d'énigmes ſacrés,
Auteurs du labyrinthe où vous vous égarez,
Alles obſcurément éclaircir vos myſtéres,
Et courez dans l'école adores vos chimères.
Il eſt d'autres erreurs, il eſt de ces dévots
Condamnes par eux même à l'ennui du repos.
Ge myſtique encloîtré, fier de ſon indolence,
Tranquille au ſein de Dieu, qu'y peut-il faire? Il penſe
Non, tu ne penſes point, tu végètes, tu dors;
Inutile à la terre, & mis au rang des morts,
Ton eſprit énervé croupit dans la molleſſe.
Réveille-toi, ſois homme, & ſors de ton yvreſſe.
L'homme eſt né pour agir, & tu prétens penſer!

It is this very reaſon I deſpiſe;
This ſupernatural gift, that makes a mite
Thinks he's the image of the infinite;

Comparing

Comparing this ſhort life, void of all reſt,
To the eternal and the ever bleſt.
This buſy puzzling ſtirrer up of doubt,
That frames deep myſteries, then finds 'em out,—
Filling with frantic crowds of thinking fools,
Theſe reverend bedlams, colleges, and ſchools;
Borne on whoſe wings, each heavy ſot can pierce
The limits of the boundleſs univerſe;
* * * * * * * * * * * *
'Tis this exalted power whoſe buſineſs lies
In nonſenſe and impoſſibilities;
This made a whimſical philoſopher
Before the ſpacious world his tub prefer;
And we have modern coxcombs who
Retire to think, 'cauſe they have nought to do.
But thoughts are given for action's government;
Where action ceaſes; thought's impertinent.
Our ſphere of action is life's happineſs;
And he who thinks beyond, is like an aſs.

Be theſe ideas true or falſe, it is certain that they are expreſſed with that energy which conſtitutes the poet. I ſhall guard againſt examining them as a philoſopher, and not quit the pencil for the compaſs: my only end in this letter is to make known the genius of the Engliſh poets; and this point I ſhall continue to adhere to.

The celebrated Waller has been much talked of in France, La Fontaine, St. Evremond, and Bayle, have have made his eulogium; but little more is known of him than his name. He had very near the ſame degree of reputation at London, that Voiture had at Paris; and I think he merited it more. Voiture lived at a time when the people were juſt burſting the bands of barbariſm, and were yet in a ſtate of ignorance. Every one wanted genius, but none had it at that time. Witticiſms were ſought after inſtead of ideas! falſe ſtones are much eaſier found than diamonds.

Voiture, born with an eaſy but frivolous genius, was the firſt who made a figure in this dawn of the French literature. Had he come after thoſe great men who

have adorned the age of Lewis XIV. he would have been under a neceſſity of poſſeſſing ſomething more than mere wit. His compoſitions might do well enough to amuſe a private family, but are by no means worthy of being tranſmitted to poſterity. It is true, Boileau praiſes him; but it is only in his firſt ſatires, that is to ſay, before his taſte was completely formed; he was then but young, and in an age when we form our opinions of men rather by the reputation they have acquired, than by their real merit. And beſides, Boileau was often very unjuſt both in his praiſes and in his cenſures. He extolled Segrais, whom nobody reads; he cenſured Quinault, whom every one repeats by heart; and he ſpeaks not a ſyllable of la Fontaine.

Waller, tho' a better poet than Voiture, was yet ſhort of perfection. His compoſitions, which are full of gallantry, breathe an air of eaſy gracefulneſs; but his negligence makes them often languid, beſides that his pieces are extremely disfigured with falſe thoughts. The Engliſh underſtood not in his time the ſecret of writing with purity and correctneſs. His ſerious works are manly and vigorous, a circumſtance no one would have looked for from the peruſal of his other performances. His funeral panegyric on Oliver Cromwell, with all its faults, paſſes for a maſter-piece. To underſtand this poem it is neceſſary to know, that Cromwell died on the ſame day on which a prodigious ſtorm happened. It begins in this manner:

Il n'eſt plus, c'en eſt fait, ſoumettons-nous au ſort.
Le Ciel a ſignalé ce jour par des tempêtes,
Et la voix du tonnerre élatant ſur nos têtes,
Vient d'annoncer ſa mort.
Par ſes derniers ſoupirs il ébranle cette Iſle,
Cette Iſle, que ſon bras fit trembler tant de fois,
Quand dans le cours de ſes exploits
Il briſait la tête des Rois,
Et ſoumettait un peuple, à ſon joug ſeul docile.
Mer, tu t'en es troublée. ô Mer! tes flots émus
Semblent dire en grondant aux plus lointains rivages
Que l'effroi de la Terre & ton Maître n'eſt plus.

Tel

Tel au Ciel autrefois s'envola Romulus,
Tel il quita la Terre au milieu des orages,
Tel d'un peuple guerrier il reçut les hommages;
Obeï dans ſa vie, à ſa mort adoré,
Son palais fut un temple, &c.

We muſt reſign; Heav'n his great ſoul does claim
In ſtorms as loud as his immortal fame.
His dying groans, his laſt breath ſhake our iſle:
And trees uncut fall for his funeral pile:
About his palace their broad roots are toſt
Into the air; ſo Romulus was loſt,
Now Rome in ſuch a tempeſt miſs'd her king,
And from obeying fell to worſhipping.
On Oeta's top thus Hercules lay dead,
With ruin'd oaks and pines about him ſpread;
Thoſe his vaſt fury from the mountain rent:
Our dying hero from the continent
Raviſh'd whole towns, and forts from Spaniards reſt,
As this laſt legacy to Britain left.
The ocean, which ſo long our hopes confin'd,
Could give no limits to his vaſter mind:
Our bounds enlargement was his lateſt toil;
Nor hath he left us priſoners to our iſle.
Under the tropic is our language ſpoke,
And part of Flanders hath receiv'd our yoke.
From civil broils he did us diſengage;
Found nobler objects for our martial rage:
And with wiſe conduct to his country ſhow'd,
The ancient way of conquering abroad.
Ungrateful then, if we no tears allow
To him that gave us peace and empire too!
Princes that fear'd him, grieve, concern'd to ſee
No pitch of glory from the grave is free.
Nature herſelf took notice of his death,
And ſighing ſwell'd the ſeas with ſuch a breath,
That to the remoteſt ſhores her billow roll'd,
Th' approaching fate of their great ruler told.

It was on occaſion of this panegyric on Cromwell that Waller made Charles II. that famous anſwer, recorded in Bayle's dictionary: The king, whom Waller, according to the old cuſtom between kings and poets, had waited upon, in order to preſent him with a poem ſtuffed with praiſes, reproached him with having written a better for Oliver. Waller anſwered, "Sir, we poets ſucceed much better in fiction than in truth." This anſwer was not ſo ſincere as that of the Dutch ambaſſador who, on the ſame king's complaining, that his nation had ſhewed leſs reſpect for him than for Cromwell, made anſwer, "Ah! Sir, Cromwell was quite a very different ſort of a man." There are courtiers even in England, and Waller was certainly one in the trueſt ſenſe of the word; but I conſider men after their death by their works only: all the reſt is with me wholly buried in oblivion. I will only remark, that Waller, born in a court, with a fortune of three thouſand pounds a-year, had neither the ſilly pride nor the ſtupidity to abandon the talent with which nature had endowed him. The Earls of Dorſet and Buckingham, my lord Halifax, and many others, did not think they derogated from their high rank and quality in becoming excellent poets, and illuſtrious writers. Their works certainly do them more honour than their titles. They have cultivated letters, as if the making of their fortunes had depended on their ſtudies. They have moreover rendered the arts and ſciences reſpectable in the eyes of the people, who in every thing ſtand in need of being guided by the great, and who, notwithſtanding, are leſs influenced by their example in England than in any other country in the univerſe.

On PRIOR; that ſingular Poem called HUDIBRAS; and Dean SWIFT.

WHEN Prior firſt came over to France as ambaſſador-plenipotentiary from Q. Anne to ſettle the terms of peace granted to Lewis XIV. and previous to the arrival of Lord Bolingbroke, who ſigned the treaty; when this peer, I ſay, firſt came to France, no one imagined him to be at once a ſtateſman and a poet. France has ſince paid England in her own coin; for cardinal Du Bois ſent our Des Touches to London, who paſſed as little for a poet in England, as Prior did in France. Prior, the plenipotentiary, was originally a waiter in a tavern; the earl of Dorſet, who himſelf was an excellent poet, and beſides loved his bottle, found him one day reading Horace on a bench in the tavern, juſt as my lord Ilay found his gardener's boy reading Newton. Ilay made his young gardener a great philoſopher, and Dorſet made a very pleaſant poet of his waiter.

Alma, or the Hiſtory of the Soul, wrote by this poet, is the moſt natural hiſtory that has been given till now, of that being ſo well perceived, and ſo little underſtood. The ſoul has her reſidence at firſt in the extremities of the body, in the feet and hands of children; from thence ſhe inſenſibly places herſelf in the centre of the body at the age of puberty; afterwards ſhe takes poſſeſſion of the heart, where ſhe produces ſentiments of love, gallantry, and heroiſm. In a ſtill riper age, ſhe mounts upwards to the head, where ſhe reaſons in the beſt manner ſhe is able; 'till at laſt, in old age, ſhe retires the Lord knows whither, like the ſap of an old tree, which evaporates, and is at laſt wholly loſt. Poſſibly this work may be rather too prolix; all pleaſantry ought to be conciſe, and perhaps the ſerious kind would hardly be the worſe for a ſmall ſpice of this quality.

The ſame Prior has compoſed a ſmall poem on the battle of Hochſtet. This is by no means comparable to his

his Hiſtory of the Soul; the only good thing in it is his apoſtrophe to Boileau.

Satyrique flateur, toi qui pris tant de peine
Pour chanter que Louis n' a point paſsé le Rhin, &c.

Pindar, that eagle, mounts the ſkies,
While virtue leads the noble way;
Too like a vulture Boileau flies,
Where ſordid int'reſt ſhews the way.
When once the poet's honour ceaſes,
From reaſon far his tranſports rove;
And Boileau for eight hundred pieces,
Makes Louis take the wall of Jove.

Our plenipotentiary concludes with a paraphraſe, conſiſting of five hundred verſes on theſe words, which are commonly aſcribed to Solomon, *All is vanity*. It were no difficult matter to have written five thouſand on the ſame topic. But wo to him that ſays all he is able to ſay.

Queen Anne being dead, and a change happening in the miniſtry, the peace of which Prior had ſketched the firſt outlines, became the deteſtation of the people; and the political bard had no other reſource left him, but an edition of his works, publiſhed by a ſubſcription ſet on foot by thoſe of his own party; after which he died like a philoſopher, that is, as every honeſt Engliſhman dies, or at leaſt is thought to die.

I ſhould be glad now to give you a ſlight idea of the poetical writings of the earl of Roſcommon and Dorſet; but I am ſenſible this would make a little volume, and, after all, I ſhould be able to give you but a very imperfect idea of ſo many different pieces. Poetry is akin to Muſic, which muſt be heard, to form any judgment of its excellence. Even when I attempt to tranſlate ſome paſſages of theſe foreign poets, I can at beſt but give you a very imperfect notion of their harmony or numbers; and I find it utterly impoſſible to convey to you the ſmalleſt notion of their cadences.

But

But above all, the Engliſh poem called Hudibras, is what puzzles me moſt to make you at all acquainted with. It is a piece wholly in the comic or burleſque ſtile, tho' the ſubject is of no leſs conſequence than the civil wars of Cromwell. This cruel war, which has been the occaſion of ſo many tears, and which has cauſed ſuch an ocean of blood to be ſpilt, has notwithſtanding given birth to a poem, which I defy the graveſt reader to peruſe, without laughing. There is ſomething of this contraſted kind to be met with in our Menippean Satire. The Romans would certainly never have thought of writing a burleſque poem on the civil wars of Cæſar and Pompey, or on the proſcriptions of Anthony and Auguſtus. Whence then comes it to paſs, that the dreadful diſaſters occaſioned in France by the League, and thoſe in England between the king and parliament, have given riſe to ſo much pleaſantry? It is undoubtedly true, that thoſe fatal broils had actually ſomewhat exceedingly ridiculous at bottom. The citizens of Paris, at the head of the faction of the Sixteen, mingled abundance of folly and impertinence with the horrors of faction. The intrigues of the women, the legate, and the monks, had a droll aſpect, notwithſtanding thoſe numberleſs calamities of which they were the occaſion. The theological diſputes, and the fanaticiſm of the Puritans in England, were fruitful fields for ridicule; and this ſource of ridicule, well laid open, was capable of affording large ſcope for pleaſantry, after theſe tragical horrors, under which it lay concealed, were once removed. Altho' the bull *Unigenitus* has been the occaſion of much bloodſhed, yet is not the little poem of *Philotamus* the leſs adapted to the ſubject; and the only reproach that can, with any juſtice, be made him is, that he is not ſo merry and diverting, and ſo diverſified, as he ought to be, and that he does not introduce in the courſe of the work, what he promiſes in the beginning.

The poem Hudibras I am now mentioning to you, ſeems to be a mixture of the *Menippean Satire* with *Don Quixote*, with this double advantage, that it is written in verſe, and that it is infinitely more witty.

As

As for the *Menippéan Satire*, it cannot ſtand in competition with it, and is really but a very middling performance. But his ſuperabundance of wit is what has made him inferior to *Don Quixote*. Taſte, pleaſing ſimplicity, the art of narration, of properly diſpoſing the different adventures, of checking the natural fertility of one's genius, are, in my humble opinion, infinitely ſuperior to mere wit. Hence it is, that Don Quixote is read by all the nations of Europe, whilſt Hudibras affords entertainment only for thoſe of his own country.

The name of this extraordinary author is Butler: he was cotemporary with Milton, and had an infinitely greater ſhare of reputation than he, from the pleaſantry and humour of his poem; whereas that of Milton is very diſmal. Butler made the enemies of Charles II, the ſubject of univerſal ridicule, and had this for his ſole recompenſe, that the king often did him the honour to quote his verſes. The battles of the knight Hudibras were much better known than thoſe of the angels and devils of Milton's *Paradiſe Loſt*. But the court of England treated the witty and diverting Butler as ill as the court above did the grave Milton, for both were in a ſtate of ſtarving or very near it.

The hero of Butler's poem was no feigned perſonage, like the Don Quixote of Michael Cervantes; he was actually a knight-baronet, that had formerly been one of Cromwell's enthuſiaſts, in whoſe ſervice he bore the office of a colonel. His name was Sir Samuel Luke. In order to underſtand the ſpirit of this poem, which is wholly ſingular in its kind, there will be a neceſſity of retrenching, at leaſt three fourths of the paſſages we want to tranſlate; for Butler is an author who never thinks he has ſaid enough. I have therefore reduced to about fourſcore verſes, the firſt four hundred in his work, to avoid a diſguſting prolixity.

Quand les profanes & les Saints
Dans l' Angleterre étaient aux priſes,
Qu'on ſe battait pour des Egliſes,
Auſſi fort que pour des Catins;
Lorſqu' Anglicans & Puritains

Faiſaient

Faiſaient une ſi rude guerre,
Et qu'au ſortir du cabaret
Les orateurs de Nazareth
Allaient battre la caiſſe en chaire ;
Que partout ſans ſavoir pourquoi,
Au nom du Ciel, au nom du Roi,
Les gens d' armes couvraient la terre ;
Alors Monſieur le Chevalier,
Longtems oiſif ainſi qu' Achile,
Tout rempli d' une ſainte bile,
Suivi de ſon grand écuyer,
S' échapa de ſon poulaillier,
Avec ſon ſabre & l' Evangile,
Et s'aviſa de guerroyer.
Sire Hudibras, cet homme rare,
Etait, dit-on, rempli d'honneur,
Avait de l' eſprit & du cœur,
Mais il en était fort avare.
D'ailleurs par un talent nouveau,
Il était tout propre au barreau,
Ainſi qu'à la guerre cruelle ;
Grand ſur les bancs, grand ſur la ſelle,
Dans les camps & dans un bureau ;
Semblable à ces rats amphibies,
Qui paraiſſant avoir deux vies,
Son rats de campagne & rats d'eau.
Mais malgré ſa grande éloquence,
Et ſon mérite & ſa prudence,
Il paſſa chez quelques ſavants
Pour être un de ces inſtruments,
Dont les fripons avec adreſſe
Savent uſer ſans dire mot,
Et qu'ils tournent avec ſoupleſſe ;
Cet inſtrument s'appelle un ſot.
Ce n'eſt pas qu'en Theologie,
En Logique, en Aſtrologie,
Il ne fût un Docteur ſubtil ;
En quatre il ſéparait un fil,
Diſputant ſans jamais ſe rendre,
Changeant de théſe tout-à-coup,
Toujeurs prêt à parler beaucoup,
Quand il fallait ne point s'étendre.

D'Hudibras

D'Hudibras la Religion
Etait tout comme ſa raiſon,
Vuide de ſens & fort profonde.
Le Puritaniſme divin,
La meilleure ſecte du monde,
Et qui certes n'a rien d'humain ;
La vraye Egliſe militante,
Qui prêche un piſtolet en main,
Pour mieux convertir ſon prochain,
A grands coups de ſabre argumente,
Qui promet les céleſtes biens
Par le gibet & par la corde,
Et damne ſans miſericorde
Les péchés des autres Chrêtiens,
Pour ſe mieux pardonner les ſiens ;
Secte qui toujours détruiſante
Se détruit elle-même enfin :
Tel Sampſon de ſa main puiſſante
Briſa le temple Philiſtin,
Mais il périt par ſa vengeance,
Et lui-même il s'enſevelit,
Ecraſé ſous la chute immenſe
De ce temple qu'il démolit.
Au nez du Chevalier antique
Deux grandes mouſtaches pendaient,
A qui les Parques attachaient
Le deſtin de la République.
Il les garde ſoigneuſement,
Et ſi jamais on les arrache,
C'eſt la chute du Parlement ;
L'Etat entier en ce moment
Doit tomber avec ſa mouſtache.
Ainſi Taliacotius
Grand Eſculapi d'Etrurie,
Répara tous les nez perdus
Par une nouvelle induſtrie :
Il vous prenait adroitement
Un morceau du cu d'un gauvre homme,
L'appliquait au nez proprement ;
Enfin il arrivait qu'en ſomme,
Tout juſte à la mort du prêteur

Tombait

Tombait le nez de l'emprunteur,
Et ſouvent dans la même biére,
Par juſtice & par bon accord,
On remettait au gré du mort
Le nez auprès de ſon derriére.
Notre grand Héros d' Albion,
Grimpé deſſus ſa haridelle
Pour venger la Religion
Avait à l'arçon de la ſelle,
Deux piſtolets & du jambon.
C'était de tout tems ſa manière ;
Sachant que ſi ſa talonnière
Pique une moitié du cheval
L'autre moitié de l'animal
Ne reſterait point en arrière.
Voila donc Hudibras parti ;
Que Dieu béniſſe ſon voyage,
Ses argumens & ſon parti,
Sa barbe rouſſe & ſon courage.

A man whoſe imagination was capable of containing a tenth part of the *vis comica*, true or falſe, that predominates through every part of this work, would ſtill be extremely diverting ; but at the ſame time he would do well to have a care how he attempts to tranſlate Hudibras : for how is it poſſible to excite laughter in readers who are foreigners, by means of the follies of perſons long ſince forgotten in the very nation where they were once ſo famous? Danté is now no longer read in Europe, becauſe his work is perpetually alluding to facts utterly unknown. The caſe is exactly the ſame with Hudibras. Moſt of the ridicule in this work falls on the theology and divines of his own time. A commentary is therefore wanted to every line. Humour that ſtands in need of being explained, from that moment ceaſes to be ſuch ; and it is very rare to find an explainer of the wit of others, have any of his own.

This is one reaſon why it will never be poſſible for the ingenious Dr. Swift to be underſtood in France, though he has juſtly acquired the title of the Engliſh Rabelais. He enjoys alſo the honour of the prieſthood,

while

while he laughs at the whole cloth. Rabelais, however, was in every reſpect ſuperior to his age, though Swift is infinitely ſuperior to Rabelais.

Our curate of Meudon, in his extravagant and unintelligible book, has diffuſed abundance of gaiety, and a ſtill greater quantity of impertinence. He was equally full of prolixity, order, and erudition. A good ſtory, which fills two pages, is bought at the expence of whole volumes of nonſenſe. There are none but thoſe of a capricious taſte, that pique themſelves on underſtanding and reliſhing the whole of his performance. The reſt of the nation laugh at the pleaſantries of Rabelais, whilſt they deſpiſe his work, and he paſſes with them for the chief of buffoons. People are ſorry that a man with ſo much wit ſhould make ſuch a low uſe o it. In ſhort, it is a drunken philoſopher, that writ only when he was not able to ſtand.

Dr. Swift is Rabelais in his rigbt ſenſes, but poliſhed by frequenting the beſt company. It is true he has not the gaiety of the former, but he is poſſeſſed of all that delicacy, judgment, proper choice of matter, and that exquiſite taſte which is wholly wanting in the curate of Meudon. His verſes are of a ſingular caſt, and almoſt utterly inimitable. True pleaſantry is his talent in proſe and verſe; but to underſtand him fully, there is a neceſſity to take a ſhort trip into his country.

In this country, which appears ſo extraordinary to the reſt of mankind, nobody was much ſurpriſed to ſee the reverend Dr. Swift, dean of a cathedral, laughing in his *Tale of a Tub* at Catholics, Lutherans, and Calviniſts. He alledges in his own vindication, that he left Chriſtianity untouched. He pretends to have ſhewn all manner of reſpect to the father, by giving a hearty drubbing to each of the three ſons. Nice people will be apt to find this apology rather too ſlight for what paſſes with them for a flagrant enormity.

This famous Tale of a Tub is an imitation of the ancient tale of the Three Inviſible Kings, which a certain father bequeathed to his three children. Theſe three rings were the Jewiſh, the Chriſtian, and the Mahometan religions. It is likewiſe an imitation of the

Hiſtory

Hiſtory of Mero and Enegu, by Fontenelle. Mero was the anagram of Rome, and Enegu that of Geneva. Theſe were two ſiſters, who pretended each to have the right of ſucceſſion to the kingdom of their father. Mero was the firſt that mounted the throne. Fontenelle repreſents her as a ſorcereſs, who was wont to ſteal bread, and who performed her inchantments by the help of dead bodies. She is exactly lord *Peter* in Swift, whilſt he is preſenting a piece of bread to his two brothers, and tells them, "Friends, here is ſome excellent Burgundy, this partridge has a moſt exquiſite flavour." The ſame lord Peter plays every where the part of Mero in Fontenelle.

Thus almoſt every compoſition is no more than an imitation. The hint of the Perſian Letters is taken from the Turkiſh Spy. Boiardo has imitated Pulci, as Arioſto has imitated Boiardo. The moſt original geniuſes borrow from each other. Michael Cervantes makes his Don Quixote a fool; but pray is Orlando any other? It would puzzle one to decide whether knight-errantry has been made more ridiculous by the groteſque painting of Cervantes, than by the luxuriant imagination of Arioſto. Metaſtaſio has taken the greateſt part of his operas from our French tragedies. Several Engliſh writers have copied us, without ſaying one word of the matter. It is with books, as it is with the fires in our houſes; one goes and lights his candle at his neighbour's, and then lights one of his own: whence he communicates to his neighbours that want his aſſiſtance. ſo that it becomes abſolutely the property of every one.

On POPE.

I FANCY it will be more eaſy for you to form ſome idea of Mr. Pope. He is in my opinion the moſt elegant, the moſt correct, and, what is ſtill more difficult to find, the moſt harmonious poet that England has hitherto produced. He has reduced the ſhrill harſhneſs of the Engliſh trumpet, to the ſoft ſweetneſs of the Lydian flute. His Eſſay on Criticiſm will ſoon be ſufficiently known in France, by the tranſlations in verſe which the abbé du Renel is about to publiſh.

What follows is a paſſage from his poem called the *Rape of the Lock*, which I have lately tranſlated with my uſual liberty; for I muſt again repeat it, I know nothing ſo execrable as a literal tranſlation of a piece of poetry.

Umbriel à l'inſtant, vieux Gnome rechigné,
Va, d'une aîle peſante, & d'un air renfrogné,
Chercher en murmurant la caverne profonde,
Où loin des doux rayons, que répand l'œil du monde,
La Déeſſe aux vapeurs a choiſi ſon ſéjour:
Les triſtes Aquilons y ſiflent à l'entour,
Et le ſouffle mal ſain de leur aride haleine
Y porte aux environs la fiévre & la migraine.
Sur un riche ſopha, derriére un paravent,
Loin des flambeaux, du bruit, des parleurs & du vent,
La quinteuſe Déeſſe inceſſamment repoſe,
Le cœur gros de chagrin, ſans en ſçavoir la cauſe,
N'ayant penſé jamais, l'eſprit toujours troublé,
L'œil chargé, le teint pâle, & l'hypocondre enflé.
La médiſante Envie eſt aſſiſe auprès d'elle,
Vieux ſpectre feminin, décrépite pucelle,
Avec un air devot déchirant ſon prochain,
Et chanſonnant les gens, l'Evangile à la main.
Sur un lit plein de fleurs, négligemment panchée,
Une jeune beauté non loin d'elle eſt couchée;
C'eſt l'affectation, qui graſſeye en parlant,
Ecoute ſans entendre, & lorgne en regardant:

Qui

Qui rougit ſans pudeur, & rit de tout ſans joie,
De cent maux differens prétend qu'elle eſt la proie,
Et pleine de ſanté ſous le rouge & le fard,
Se plaint avec molleſſe, & ſe pâme avec art.

Umbriel, a duſky melancholy ſprite,
As ever ſullied the fair face of light,
Down to the central earth, his proper ſcene,
Repairs to ſearch the gloomy cave of ſpleen.

Swift on his ſooty pinions flits the gnome,
And in a vapour reach'd the diſmal dome.
No cheerful breeze this ſullen region knows,
The dreaded eaſt is all the wind that blows;
Here in a grotto, ſhelter'd cloſe from air,
And ſcreen'd in ſhades from day's deteſted glare,
She ſighs for ever on her penſive bed,
Pain at her ſide, and Megrim at her head.

Two handmaids wait the throne, alike in place,
But differing far in figure and in face:
Here ſtood *Ill-Nature*, like an ancient maid,
Her wrinkled form in black and white array'd;
With ſtore of pray'rs, for mornings, nights, and noons,
Her hand is fill'd; her boſom with lampoons.
There Affectation, with a ſickly mien,
Shews in her cheek the roſes of eighteen.
Practis'd to liſp, and hang the head aſide,
Faints into airs, and languiſhes with pride:
On the rich quilt ſinks with becoming woe;
Wrapt in a gown, for ſickneſs and for ſhow.

Pope's Eſſay on Man, is in my opinion the fineſt, the moſt uſeful, and the ſublimeſt didactic poem that has ever been written in any language. The ground-work of the whole, it is true, may be found in lord Shafteſbury's Characteriſtics, for which reaſon I cannot ſee why Mr. Pope has given all the honour of it to lord Bolingbroke, without mentioning a word of the famous Shafteſbury, the diſciple of Locke.

As there is nothing in metaphyſics but what has been often thought in every age and nation where the talents of the mind are cultivated, this ſyſtem has a great conformity

formity with that of Leibnitz; who pretends, that, of all poſſible worlds, God muſt certainly have choſen the beſt; and that, even in this beſt, all the irregularities of our globe, as well as the follies of its inhabitants. ought to have a place. It has alſo a reſemblance to the notion of Plato, which ſays, that, in the infinite chain of beings, our earth, our bodies, and our ſouls, are ſo many neceſſary links. But neither Leibnitz nor Pope admit of thoſe changes, which, according to Plato, have happened to thoſe links of it, our ſouls and bodies. Plato, in his unintelligible proſe, wrote like a poet; whilſt Pope, in his admirable verſion, is truly a great philoſopher. He ſays, all things have at all times been, even from the very infancy of nature, as they are; that is, as they ought to be: "Whatever is, is beſt." I could not help being pleaſed, I own, to find he agreed with me in a point which I had maintained ſeveral years ſince.

"You are filled with wonder to think God ſhould have made man with faculties ſo limited, ſo ignorant, and ſo much ſhort of true happineſs. Why do not you rather wonder he did not make him infinitely more ſo?" When a Frenchman and an Engliſhman happen to agree in any point, you may ſwear they are then in the right.

The ſon of the famous Racine has publiſhed a letter of Pope addreſſed to him, with a recantation of this doctrine. This letter is written in the ſtile and manner of Fenelon: it was delivered him by Ramſay, the editor of Telemachus; that Ramſay who was the imitator of Telemachus, and much ſuch another as Boyer was of Corneille; that Scotch Ramſay who modeſtly demanded admittance into the French academy; in a word, by that Ramſay who was ſadly diſappointed at not being a doctor of the Sorbonne. This I know, as does every man of letters in England, that Pope, with whom I was very intimately acquainted, could hardly read French; ſpoke not one word of our language; never wrote one ſingle ſyllable in the language, not being capable to do it; and, if he ever wrote ſuch a letter to the ſon of our Rachine, God muſt certainly have endowed him with the gift of tongues, by way of recompence for having compoſed ſo wonderful a work as his Eſſay on Man.

END OF THE SEVENTEENTH VOLUME.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY AU 17 1912 CAMBRIDGE